

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been
downloaded from the King's Research Portal at
<https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



An Examination of the Ecumenical Practice of Paul as Disclosed in his Epistles.

Fisher, E. B

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ECUMENICAL PRACTICE
OF PAUL AS DISCLOSED IN HIS EPISTLES

by

Ernest Brayton Fisher

A Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D.
in the Faculty of Theology of the
University of London

Date: April, 1975

Supervisor: Professor C. F. Evans



. ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with the question of how ecumenical Paul's gospel was, i.e., what the scope of his mission was in geographical, ethnical, and sociological terms. Involved in this are Paul's Hebraic and eschatological mode of thinking (summarized in chapter one), and the historical situations in which it worked itself out in practice. Since the latter have not generally been examined on the basis of Paul's letters alone without dependence upon Acts, the problem of chronology is entailed.

The method has been (1) to examine Paul's letters alone for allusions that may suggest a chronology from which to begin the investigation of his mission; (2) to examine the letters for evidence of concrete situations from which the goal and character of this mission may be discussed; and (3) to consider its theological nature only in relation to such historical contexts. In this investigation, the chronology and Paul's missionary intentions were found to be so interrelated that they could not be separated from each other, and so had to be considered together.

The conclusions reached are that Paul's mission to Macedonia began immediately after his first meeting with apostles in Jerusalem; that his gospel was ethnically and sociologically universalist; that it intended to embrace all groups of mankind on the basis of equality in Christ; that it was to be implemented in history in the church; that it was to be exercised by methods which reflected and corresponded with its ecumenical character; and finally that Romans was his exposition of his gospel, primarily for oral presentation

in Jerusalem (though dispatched elsewhere in writing), to dispose especially Jewish Christians to its adoption as the basis for world mission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER I. THE BACKGROUND OF PAUL'S ECUMENISM	15
Election and Mission (16)--The Revelation of Messiahship (19)	
CHAPTER II. GENERAL PLAN OF PAUL'S MISSIONARY ACTIVITIES . .	33
Did Paul Spend Time in Syria and Cilicia? (35)--Recon- struction of a Plausible Plan of Activity (40)	
CHAPTER III. AN ECUMENICAL CHURCH IN EVERY COMMUNITY	60
Paul's Activity Among the Gentiles (60)--Distinctions Abolished in Christ (80)	
CHAPTER IV. ECUMENICAL PRINCIPLES IN PRACTICE	95
Paul Keeps Contact with His Churches (96)--Paul's Use of Associates (100)--Paul and His Team (117)--Work for a Livelihood (133)	
CHAPTER V. ECUMENICITY OF PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP	138
The Significance of "I" Passages in Paul's Letters to His Own Churches (139)--Paul and a Co-operative Mission to the Gentiles (153)	
CHAPTER VI. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS	174
The Historical Background (174)--Romans as an Address for Jerusalem (182)--Paul's Purpose in Writing to the Romans (206)--Note on Philippians (212)	
CHAPTER VII. CONCLUSION	219
ABBREVIATIONS	236
NOTES	238
Notes to the Introduction (238)--to Chapter I (242)--to Chapter II (248)--to Chapter III (259)--to Chapter IV (272)--to Chapter V (287)--to Chapter VI (293)--to Note on Philippians, continuous with notes to Chapter VI (303-306)--to Chapter VII (307)	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	310

INTRODUCTION

The subject investigated in this thesis is Paul's ecumenism. By this is meant not only his theological understanding of his mission but also the observable and measurable ecumenical missionary activity revealed in his letters. Related problems to be considered include the character of the people to whom Paul went; the geographical scope of his mission; the basic ecumenical content of his message; the organizational methods he used in his missionary work; his own personal relationship to and involvement in his mission; and the amount of agreement between his practice and teaching and those of others in the church of his time.

Until quite recently, in reaction from the historicism of the period of Deissmann, scholars have tended to approach Pauline research primarily from the point of view of establishing what was universal in his theology, and from there have interpreted the historical aspects of events and situations. Since then, investigation has endeavoured to uncover the relationships of events, so as, if possible, to differentiate between the historical aspects and the revelatory aspects which faith discerned in them.¹

In so far as the views held by the missionary Paul are expressed in the language and the thought-forms appropriate to the local situations to which they are addressed, a knowledge of those situations, of the issues involved, and of the intentions of the author in relation to them is a prerequisite for the understanding of any theological concepts which may have determined his mission.² Thus it is impossible to appreciate Paul's ecumenism fully until not

only his basic theological ideas and any important developments of them are known, but until they are related to the actual problems that he faced, to his methods of work, to his relationships to his environment, including the people closest to him, e.g., his colleagues and his fellow workers, as well as his churches, and until his own conception of himself in relation to his mission has been examined.

For this to be done, however, it is necessary to have, so far as is possible, a reliable chronology both of Paul's letters and of his missionary activity. Here at the outset there is considerable cleavage of opinion amongst scholars who have concerned themselves with the subject, in particular as to the value that is to be attached to, and the use that is to be made of Acts in attempting to establish such a chronology. On the one hand, there is what may be called the "traditional" view, the most recent detailed statement of which is G. Ogg's, The Chronology of the Life of Paul.³ This, following the lines of previous studies, though with modifications of them here and there, reconstructs the chronology basically from the framework supplied by Acts.⁴ It sets out the statements from ancient writers outside the New Testament which are relevant for establishing the dating of persons and events referred to in Acts, and reviews the problems involved in correlating these statements with Acts, critically assesses them and endeavours to resolve them.

Skillfully as this is done it is open to a number of criticisms. The first is admitted by Ogg himself when more than once he refers to the secondary nature of Acts, and to its shortcomings, omissions, and adaptations of material to its purposes.⁵ Critical analysis of the gospels has thrown some light on Luke's handling of his sources in the gospel part of his two volume work, and shows him

hardly ever able to establish or improve upon the chronological sequence of the material available to him in his sources, and while Acts is a different kind of work from the Gospel and the circumstances of its composition and the sources to hand may have been of a different kind, nevertheless Luke's performance in his first volume at least puts a question mark against too confident a use of Acts as the basis for a reconstruction of chronology and sequence of events.⁶

A second criticism is related to the first, and is also suggested by Ogg's book itself. Those who use Acts for their framework of Paul's chronology are bound to choose and to interpret such evidence as is provided by external sources (e.g., Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Eusebius, Orosius) concerning dates of important events, edicts, or accessions in such a way that it harmonizes with the information given in Acts, despite a previous recognition that Acts is not always historically trustworthy. Four dates contributed by external sources are usually selected--the great famine, Claudius' edict of the expulsion of Jews from Rome, Festus' accession as procurator of Judaea, and Gallio's proconsulship of Achaia. But the first of these is of dubious application, the second and third admit of a wide margin of variation, and only the last is fixed.⁷ From this fixed date--the spring of 51 to the spring of 52--the other dates are assigned on the assumption that the time schedule of Acts, considered as a consecutive narrative, is accurate as its author relates Paul's activities and journeys and the duration of his stay in the several regions and cities, alluding at times to external events. Hence that ancient authority is chosen and its information so interpreted as to fit a scheme that harmonizes the dates. From the chosen fixed date, generally Gallio's proconsulship, 49 is selected as the date of Claudius' edict and 59 as the likely date of

Festus' accession. Such a method, however, which seeks to arrive at a firm chronology by arranging and dating evidence from external sources itself uncertain by reference to other uncertain sources of chronological data such as Eusebius, Orosius, or even Acts itself, is vulnerable, and the different arrangements and explanations made by different scholars in the course of handling the evidence and achieving the harmonization show how vulnerable it is.

A third criticism is more strictly methodological. It was stated by Donald W. Riddle and then by his pupil John Knox in the form that the letters of Paul must remain the primary source not only for the understanding of the letters themselves but also for any biography of Paul, and that Acts must remain a secondary source at best.⁸ They have been followed by others working on the same principles, notably J. C. Hurd, Jr.,⁹ C. H. Buck and G. Taylor,¹⁰ and M. J. Suggs,¹¹ and the same approach is to be found in the works of J. Munck,¹² G. Bornkamm,¹³ and M. Enslin.¹⁴ This has not meant for them that Acts is never to be used, but that it is to be used with great caution, and only when all that is possible for the purpose has been extracted from the letters. Thus to some extent Buck and Taylor have recourse to Acts to fill the gaps when Paul's letters are simply lacking in information.¹⁵ Hurd does not altogether succeed in his attempt to reconstruct the background to I Corinthians without relying on Acts, e.g., for information concerning a dietary decree issued at the Jerusalem conference,¹⁶ while Suggs, who has resisted this temptation and has relied only on statements within the letters which allude to historical points for establishing the chronology, has taken Knox's contentions more seriously. These studies are, however, by their nature limited in scope; in the case of Suggs to the beginnings of Paul's career, and in the case of Hurd to the

origin of I Corinthians. These are not studies of Paul's ecumenism, and do not extend over his whole missionary career. Buck and Taylor, in the first section of their book, where they rely on Paul's letters alone for the development of their chronology, have carried out a study over the whole of Paul's career. They have not, however, arrived at their sequence of events by relying wholly on direct statements and allusions of a historical nature, but depend on the presuppositions that Paul's thought underwent a precise and measurable development,¹⁷ and after establishing a pivotal point, viz., the relative position of three key letters (I and II Corinthians and Romans),¹⁸ they find a pattern of theological development which they then proceed to impose upon all the letters, necessarily assuming that the extant key letters, especially II Corinthians,¹⁹ fall properly into place. Bornkamm, in spite of his acknowledgement of the secondary and chronologically unreliable nature of Acts, nevertheless uses it for determining Paul's chronology and purposes.²⁰

The attempt will be made here to use this historical approach more completely by using only the primary sources for chronological data, and especially in relation to the study of Paul's mission as a whole. As Hurd has observed, the actual sequence of Paul's letters arrived at by this approach does not differ very much from that of the "traditional" approach.²¹ It is, as we shall see, in the estimate of Paul's missionary career that the greatest difference emerges, so that on the traditional view there has perhaps been insufficient appreciation of the intensity with which he maintained his missionary campaign, and the basic intentions of certain letters, e.g., Romans, have not been adequately considered, especially in relation to Paul's ecumenical strategy.²²

In examining these questions, if Acts is not to be depended

upon for historical facts and interpretations unsubstantiated by Paul's letters, it will be necessary to establish, so far as the use of the primary sources will allow, a proper relationship of the letters and the sequence of events. Thus after a review in the first chapter of the background from which Paul starts, the chronology of Paul's missionary career and the historical situation in which he wrote each letter are examined. How these situations were related to one another and how he met them are considered so as to gain some insight, if possible, into the ecumenical concepts which are revealed in them. The study presupposes Paul to be an active missionary who is out in the field, working towards a definite missionary goal, which in concrete historical situations, for one reason or another, prompts him to write letters, from which this goal may be ascertained. By using these letters alone, an attempt will be made to reconstruct the events, sequence of letters, and issues at stake in Paul's missionary career.

In this research, the following letters are considered as genuinely Paul's: those universally so regarded, i.e., Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians; in addition those generally accepted as authentic, i.e., Philemon, I Thessalonians, and Philippians;²³ also, though its authenticity is often questioned, II Thessalonians;²⁴ and finally, as basically Paul's own work, Colossians.²⁵

Where parallels suggest it, references may occasionally be made to Acts in the notes, but will not be used for the primary determination of chronology, of the sequence of letters, and of ecumenical goals. This procedure, however, is not intended to discredit Acts, written possibly at the close of the first century, in its own primary apologetic intention; nor is it intended to disregard altogether such traditions in Acts as, after critical examination,

can reasonably be regarded as free from either the compiler's editorial adaptation or legendary embellishment, and as yielding information that can be considered as evidence coming from the time and place of the origin of the particular source-fragment (or one might call it, memory-fragment). The procedure is only to stress that Acts cannot be used (even where Paul is silent) to provide a chronology of events, a sequence of letters, or an interpretation of ecumenical concepts held by Paul in the late first half and middle of the first century. However, when detached from the chronological arrangement of events and the author's own views of mission and theology belonging to the end of the first century, tradition-fragments used by the compiler of Acts as his source material often correspond very closely to Paul's own statements, to allusions to conditions and situations met by him in his areas of missionary endeavour, and to matters concerning himself. The accuracy of local colour in Acts and touches characteristic of a first-hand account have often been noted.²⁶ This may be attributable, not to the collector of the material, but to the provider of the particular memory-document, who himself evidently must have been a native of the region and of the local church. It should be noted, however, that by the time of the author of Acts, the memory is often old, and possibly in many instances, several removes from the event. Also in the interim period, the memory of the person or persons concerned may have faded on details and even on the import of major events. Thus some fragments of tradition, especially those least worked over by the compiler, may contain incidental information consistent with what Paul himself may give, which, without dependence on Acts for chronology, sequence, or interpretation, may supply a clue that may help with understanding events in Paul's career or the meaning of his

ecumenism. These clues can only be used with caution, and the possibility of error should be admitted when they are used. Such instances of the use of Acts as possibly providing clues for interpreting events and for understanding Paul's personal involvement in his mission are relegated to the notes. Reason for their use will be given there, with substantiations, however, mostly from allusions in Paul's letters.

The method employed has been first to gather available, measurable data in the epistles, and by analysis and induction to arrive at the general principles that may have governed particular actions in their historical situation, and so to avoid conclusions already contained in presuppositions and premises before the data are methodically observed. In this way it is hoped that the historical, observable causes which had as their effects the relevant historical situations in which Paul (in relation to his ecumenism) was involved, and his own part in these causes, might be detected. It is further hoped that the basic significance of his thought-forms may be discovered, so that a clearer picture of his ecumenism may be achieved. Thus it is the method of this study to investigate Paul's ecumenism not only from a textual examination of the theological statements that he made concerning it, but from an examination of his own observable involvement in his mission, i.e., by examination of his missionary methods and goals as they are to be detected from the way in which he conducted his missionary work, which may in themselves throw light on his theological statements. His expressed intentions may not always have worked out in practice, but how he reacted to particular situations may enable one to perceive what lay behind his aspirations and so give substance to his words. In chapter III, therefore, where Paul went, what people he communicated

with, how much the principles of ecumenism were reflected in his own contacts with the local community or with the larger community in which he was involved, are investigated.

Then the questions arise of how much Paul was himself involved in the working out of his theological vision, and how personally committed he was to the ecumenism he declared, the investigation of which may shed further light upon the nature of the ecumenism that Paul was projecting in his audience. These questions are studied by an examination of Paul's letters, with special attention to their sequence. From this certain patterns of missionary behaviour appear to emerge. These are presented in chapters IV and V, which deal with Paul's method of work, first in relation to his own field of operation and to his closest colleagues (chapter IV), and then in relation to wider fields, and to other workers with whom he is inclining to co-operate (chapter V). At the same time, because related to the question of his personal involvement, an examination is made of allusions in his letters to his working for his livelihood, and the possible relation of this to his missionary activity. In the course of the studies in chapters IV and V, information further to that contained in chapter II emerged, which suggested additional chronological relationships of events and of sequence of letters, and when possible to do so, these are fitted into their appropriate place. In each case this was done by uncovering in Paul's letters allusions to historical events or situations, rather than by superimposing a supposed theological development, or by relying upon chronological evidence from secondary sources.

As an extension of this examination of the historical situation behind Paul's ecumenism, the object, the nature, and the importance (to the study of ecumenism) of Romans is examined.

Because of previous conclusions in the thesis about Paul's missionary conceptions and methods, a different orientation and intention have been argued for this letter than those usually held. This and the close of his missionary activity are the subjects of chapter VI. The subject of the concluding chapter (VII) is the relation of Paul's theology to his missionary activity in regard to his ecumenism.

Biblical quotations are taken from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, Old Testament copyrighted 1952, and New Testament, second edition, copyrighted 1971, published in The Holy Bible: An Ecumenical Edition (New York, London, 1973).

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND OF PAUL'S ECUMENISM

Gal. 1:15-16, the most compressed statement by Paul of his vocation, envisages a universal mission of the God of Judaism as now apprehended through his Son. It would seem to presuppose theological conceptions concerning God's purpose for the world and concerning Israel's messiah which lie behind this mission, and which indeed are necessary to it.¹ It is important to explore what these conceptions were, and how they form part of the background which determines Paul's pragmatic adaptation of his mission to circumstances as they arise and which, therefore, shapes his actions in regard to it.

As he himself declares, and as recent research has made abundantly clear,² Paul was "a Hebrew born of Hebrews" (Phil. 3:5), and to the Hebrew the God of Israel is the God of the whole world. The very names that the Israelite gives to his God emphasize his deity's role as universal creator with absolute power, complete freedom of will, and cosmic dominion.³ Thus for the Israelite, the one who controls the destiny of Israel (Hos. 11:1-4) is the one who likewise determines the history of all other peoples (Jer. 27:5). All nations without exception are under his God's universal sway.⁴ This recognition and exaltation of God's universal sovereignty continues strongly not only in the Old Testament but also through apocalyptic and other intertestamental literature.⁵ Yet it must be emphasized that this body of conceptual data concerning the Hebraic-Judaistic God is universalistic in a limited sense, in that it is only in Hebraic-Judaistic literature that this truth about the God

of Israel is actually known. Israel's God is not known outside Israel as the universal God.

Election and Mission

The Hebrew people themselves, however, held this universalistic belief along with an intense consciousness of a close relationship through the election and the covenant with this God who is so supremely known in Israel (cf. Rom. 9:4, 6-13; 11:1-2a, 28-29). God had chosen Israel as his people. He had elected them; he had revealed himself to them. He had entered into covenant relationship with them. It was a movement from the creator to the creation and not vice versa. So in his reference to his own vocation (Gal. 1:15), Paul depicts God as acting with like supreme freedom of will, εὐδόκησεν, when he was set apart by God, ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. . . . The pattern is distinctly Hebraic (cf. Jer. 1:5; Is. 49:1). Paul, the child of the people, recapitulated in himself the experience of the parent nation.

In Israel's history, however, election and covenant had come to mean, not just favour in the sight of God, but responsibilities (cf. Amos 3:2). Especially is this so in respect of God's action in history and the resolution of history in eschatological terms.⁶ The teleological is in the election itself. It may be considered the primary reason for the election. Just as the end is in the beginning, so the eschatological is the reason for the protological, and, when accomplished, will become as the beginning (Is. 46:10; 55:10-13; cf. I Cor. 2:7).⁷ What the teleological is--what the eschatological is--became known through revelation in Israel's history as that which was seen, felt, and interpreted by God's servants, the prophets (Amos 3:3-8; cf. I Cor. 2:10-13). So election came to mean, not

favour, but mission. Israel's mission was not to herself, but to the nations of the world. The concept of the universality of God could not be contained within the limiting confines of a single people. What was true in principle had to become so in actuality. Israel's vocation was to bring her revealed, universal God to the world, that the universal God known uniquely by the chosen people Israel might become the God of a single people, mankind.

The revelation of this mission was long and hard and often reluctantly received. Harsh history had to be interpreted, and the prophets performed the task. Their people's suffering, their rejection, their calamities, clearly focused the thought of the prophets on one thing: God is the chief actor determining the course of history; he used nations who did not know him to chastise his rebellious children. Then he chastised the nations who arrogantly assumed that they had been the cause of Israel's downfall, and proved himself the lord of history by redeeming his people Israel. God did all this so that the nations might know him, might worship him as the one true God, and ultimately, might all declare him God, live in his truth, and realize everlasting prosperity and peace. In practice, Israel's history is full of tensions as one aspect or another is emphasized, election or mission, vindictiveness or compassion, hate or love, particularism or universalism.⁸ Such tensions existed into New Testament times and are in Paul's own background and in the background of his struggle for ecumenism.⁹ The Old Testament idea of world mission, even its height of universalism in II and III Isaiah, is Israel-centred (cf., e.g., Is. 49:22-23). Throughout II Isaiah such passages of universalism must be read in the light of these restrictions which the prophet himself also summarized (cf., e.g., 52:1). The people of Israel were witnesses before all people

and nations (Is. 42:5-12; 43:10; 44:8; 49:1--the servant), not only of the universality of the one God, but also of the way of salvation that God had revealed to mankind in Israel's own history, the way of the law.¹⁰ Its splendour was conceived in terms of earthly existence for Jerusalem.

Universal salvation was the determined will of God from the beginning, the fulfilment of which all creation has long awaited.¹¹ It seems, therefore, that the destruction of wayward Israelites, and even of Gentiles, was temporary, that is, a necessary act within an earlier-than-final phase of the eschatological plan of salvation, namely, in the present. The eschatological age beyond this age would see the return of all Israelites from the Diaspora, after which all peoples would worship God. The details of that last phase, e.g., the influx of Gentiles, were not enunciated clearly. That was to be the work of God, and so was outside of Israel's province. The present relationships were their main concern. The rest lies with God.¹²

In apocalyptic literature, which tended to be much more nationalistic in view point and far more vindictive and retaliatory in regard to humanity, there was despair that any of these changes would take place in time. Their advent was beyond history in the heavenly realm (e.g., 4 Ezra 7:26-44; 8:52-62).¹³ There the nations, presumably all who denied the Lord, would see whom they had denied, after which eternal annihilation awaited them (4 Ezra 7:32-43; also Wisdom 12:27; II Bar. 50:2-51:16). Nevertheless, even these apocalyptic writers granted to proselytes a share in the glorious resurrection of the faithful, and so, via proselytism, they maintained a restricted universalism, i.e., a universalism that was at the same time a religious particularism according to the practices

of the religion of Israel (II Bar. 42:5; cf. IV Ezra 3:36).

The Revelation of Messiahship

In Gal. 1:15-16 Paul sees the universal mission of the God of Israel as having come to a reality in his Son. That is, Paul's missionary vocation is messianically based. Although the Messiah was not essential to Israelite conceptions of God's plan of salvation, and in some views is entirely absent,¹⁴ yet for Paul the Messiah was the centre around which eschatology and ecumenism revolved. Messianism expressed itself in various forms, which here may best be viewed in relation to Paul's Christian concepts, for the resurrection experiences completely changed the whole pattern of Paul's theological thinking.¹⁵ How much that was changed can be gathered from his letters.

1. The Christ

The usual appellation Paul employs for Jesus is Χριστός, with and without the article, i.e., used as a title or as a proper name, as did others. Χριστός appears alone in 130 verses, as Ἰησοῦς Χριστός in 21, Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς in 32, and in the combination κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός in 27. Paul does not use the term, the Son of man.

Judaism changed the figure of the Iranian Primordial Man into the concept of the eschatological Son of man, so pre-existent in the sense of being the first created of all creation, and so present with God as the type of the ideal Israel (as individual or corporate being).¹⁶ This may be reflected in I Cor. 8:5-6 where Paul ridicules pagan multiplicity of gods and lords and asserts in contrast the Jewish faith in but εἷς Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν. Then he

adds, καὶ εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.¹⁷ The change in prepositions is significant. God is the creator, not Christ. Creation comes from (out of) God and has its existence in God (rendered 'for'). But in accordance with the eschatological Man (who has been beside God from the beginning) man was created. Thus the creative act is totally God's act, which is Hebraic thinking.¹⁸

In Jewish apocalyptic literature this eschatological Son of man is kept secret and will only be revealed at the proper time, at the eschaton, when he will again be named before the Lord of Spirits, at which time he is enthroned and appears in glory.¹⁹ This idea is reflected in the literature of I Enoch. It is with such ideas that Paul shows himself familiar, but according to Paul the secret has already been divulged (I Cor. 2:7-8). The secret is the fact that the crucified Jesus who has been raised from the dead is that eschatological Man.

2. The Renewal or Restoration

Whether in the earlier prophetic literature, where a Davidic scion returns to Jerusalem, or in Daniel where the Son of man (who is the true Israel) is vindicated, or in apocalyptic literature, e.g., I Enoch, when the Son of man is enthroned in heaven, or even in the later Judaistic fusion of the messianic and apocalyptic concepts into the idea of the coming of an interim period, i.e., the Kingdom of the Messiah which is followed by the Kingdom of God, in each case there is a restoration of conditions of bliss and triumph. All this involves the restoration of perfection, or the renewal, or even the re-creation of the earth and of the heavens. Thus the eschatological Man's presence with the eschatological people implies the restoration of the ideal people in the ideal community. This for

Paul had already happened.

Paul appreciated the fact that as a Christian he was already joined to Christ, the eschatological Man now exalted to the position of Son of God in power. As one "in Christ", he was a new creation; that is, he now had his being (or state of existence) in Christ (II Cor. 5:17). Inasmuch as Christ is the Second Man, a corporate eschatological being, then it follows that Paul lived in the Second Adam and was no longer determined by the First Adam (I Cor. 15:21-22, cf. Rom. 5:12-21), and so he finds his life determined by the new centre, Christ.²⁰ Christ (or the Spirit of God²¹), who resided in him, determined his new nature by re-creating the old spirit of Paul (Rom. 8:1-16), even as the old Adam, which once resided in him, was the former determinant of his being (Rom. 5:12-14; II Cor. 3:13). In this sense, Paul and Christ (as once Paul and Adam) are one. Because of this new act of creation which God had carried out (or fulfilled) in Christ, now every human being, Jew or Gentile, through faith may also participate in it (e.g., Rom. 3:21-22; 9:24; I Cor. 12-13; Gal. 3:26).

3. Christ's Reign a Present Reality

A distinction should be made between the Messianic Kingdom and the Kingdom of God which follows it at the Parousia. The Messianic Kingdom, as conceived by the Judaism contemporary with New Testament times, was to be the interim reign of the Messiah on earth, between the close of the present age, and before the general resurrection which would mark the advent of the Kingdom of God.²² Here Paul makes a change. Whereas the Jews anticipated the coming of the Messiah in his kingdom at "the end of the ages", which would then be a reign of a certain number of years duration, after which would come the Kingdom of God, Paul perceives that upon his generation

"the end of the ages [τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων] has come", i.e., the reign of the Messiah had already begun (I Cor. 10:11). Therefore, it is not a distant hope, but a present reality (II Cor. 3:7-18).²³ So, too, in Rom. 8:35, though the persecutions, afflictions, and other evils enumerated are in future hypothetical terms in what are rhetorical questions, the situations depicted are the immediate situations of Paul and those addressed. This is borne out by Rom. 8:37 where Paul is referring not to the Parousia but to the power of the love of Christ at work in himself and in his readers in the present. It is the age of the Spirit. That condition naturally follows from the fact that Christians are already changed beings (II Cor. 5:17), and that this state now exists because Christ reigns as lord over all (cf. Rom. 8:14-17, 23, 31-39; II Cor. 3:18).

Another passage depicting the age of the Messiah as already a living reality is found in II Cor. 3:3. Here Paul is referring to an existing condition, ἔστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἐνγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι ἀλλὰ πνεύματι Θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίναις.

Jeremiah's prophecy (31:33) has been fulfilled. The act of carving the law on the tablets of stone was God's act (Ex. 31:18; cf. 32:16 וְהָיוּ לְפָנַי כְּבִרְתָּן). So here, the act of writing on the human heart is also God's act (cf. Jer. 31:33), "a letter from Christ [ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ] delivered by us, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God". The recipients of these words are not Paul's letter but Christ's.²⁴

Christ, however, is already exalted and enthroned. He sits at the right hand of God and is even now interceding for men (Rom. 8:34; Phil. 2:9-11; cf. Col. 3:1). There he governs over every rule

and authority, power and principality, a dominion given to him by God who accomplished the subjection of these forces by paradoxically turning the Cross, which they had expected to be their triumph over the forces of righteousness, into a public example of their defeat.²⁵

Christians are part of Christ's Kingdom now, even though they continue to live in a temporal, terrestrial mode of existence. Life for them on earth, however, is like being residents in a foreign land, for "our commonwealth is in heaven" (Phil. 3:20). It is to that other-worldly realm that Christians now belong. It would seem, therefore, that Paul has again changed the normal patterns of eschatological thinking. The kingdom of the Son of man is entirely other-worldly; that of the Messiah is this-worldly. Paul's idea is a combination; Christ reigns from heaven, but his rule is making itself felt in time and space, on earth, now. Therefore, what was still a future hope for the Jews, has become a present reality for Paul. This is the age in which the nations are to come to Jerusalem, though for Paul, the Jerusalem of eschatological importance is the Jerusalem that is above (Gal. 4:26).²⁶ This startling awareness of a totally new cosmic situation provides the background and the impetus for his whole missionary career.

4. Christ Now Carries on the Work of the Realm

As a natural corollary to the above, Paul perceived that Christ is already actively engaged in the business of his realm. Christ is now conquering cosmic powers (I Cor. 15:24-28),²⁷ as well as transforming believers after the image of their creator (Col. 3:9-11; cf. II Cor. 5:17). The Lord of Creation is re-creating or completing his likeness in man through Christ, who is the Second Adam or the life-giving Spirit (I Cor. 15:45). Thus, Paul sees the end-time, in which he lives, completing at the Parousia the creation

story which started in beginning-time, and the perfection of the Last Day returns to the perfection of the First Day, when creation becomes complete. Thus in the glorified Christ, Hebrew teleology has found its fulfilment.

Of course, before the Last Day comes, Christ, as reigning Lord, has much work to do. It is in this context that Gal. 1:15-16 has special significance, and that Paul's ecumenical mission is to be understood.²⁸ The creation spoken of is not yet manifested and so is not yet visible to the rest of creation which groans and longs for the day of the revealing of the sons of God (Rom. 8:18-25). Yet it is a guaranteed hope (II Cor. 5:5). Consequently, it is to the Last Day that Paul looks forward; for that Last Day will not be the beginning of all this work which is preparatory to the establishment of the Kingdom of God, but rather the end of it. The Last Day will reveal the final triumph of Christ, when the work that he has been accomplishing will be manifested, when the trumpet will blow (I Cor. 15:52), and the transformations will take place, at which time all nature will be renewed at the moment of the revealing of the sons of God, who up to this time have been so renewed in spirit, i.e., in principle, inwardly, but then outwardly (Rom. 8:18-23).²⁹

That Christ's Kingdom ends and the Kingdom of God begins at the Parousia appears to be a logical deduction from Paul's statement that the last enemy to be conquered is to be death itself (I Cor. 15:26). That, of course, means that before that happens all else must be subjected to Christ in essence, if not in visible fact, so that the total change may take place at the instant that Christ appears. For death, so it would seem, is conquered at the same moment that the transformation from the corporeal to the incorporeal, and the resurrection from the dead take place: "in the twinkling of

an eye" we shall be changed and shall meet Christ in the air (I Cor. 15:51-57; I Thess. 4:16-17). Yet, according to I Cor. 15:24-26, 28, at that climax, Christ hands over the kingdom to his Father, and he himself becomes subject to God, so that "God may be everything to every one" (I Cor. 15:28). Thus, the final consummation, the "day of our Lord Jesus Christ", is not the beginning of the Kingdom of the Risen Christ, but rather its glorious triumph which brings in the Kingdom of God after Christ's final victory over all his enemies which will have accomplished the purpose of his reign (cf. Rom. 8:38-39; I Cor. 15:24-28; Phil. 3:20-21).

This bears on the interpretation of "the restraining one" of II Thess. 2:7, whom Oscar Cullmann and J. Munck, following him, take as a reference by Paul to himself and his function.³⁰ Joseph Coppens, however, argues that in this passage Paul sees "the appearance of a formidable apostasy [τὸ κατέχον] and of a personage [ὁ κατέχων] particularly hostile to God and to his Messiah" as preludes to the parousia of Christ.³¹ The great celestial mysteries and the time of the Last Day are in the hands of Providence. So the mystery of iniquity (or the great apostasy) will continue until Christ is revealed in his own time (i.e., the αὐτός in v. 6b referring to Christ, not to ὁ κατέχων). At the moment of the return of Christ, the appearance of the great adversary, i.e., the Antichrist, will also take place, at which time Christ "will slay him with the breath of his mouth and destroy him by his appearing and his coming." This interpretation of the passage would be supported by what has been said above about Paul's understanding of Christ's warfare against the celestial powers ruling the world (cf. I Cor. 2:6-8; 15:24-27a).³² In any case it seems clear that though Paul looks forward to the parousia of Christ, which

corresponds to the consummation of Christ's cosmic struggle against evil, he himself is more concerned with that aspect of Christ's warfare that is relevant to the church's temporal existence, that is, with the witnessing and the preaching of the gospel.

5. The Parousia is Imminent

In all Paul's letters the Parousia is conceived as coming during his own generation (Rom. 8:18-24a; 13:11-14; Phil. 1:20; 2:16; 4:5).³³ Paul writes to the Thessalonians from the background of the imminent coming of the Lord Jesus (I Thess. 1:9-10; 3:12-13). The nearness of the Parousia is also evident where Paul tells of his joy in the Thessalonians who are to be his crown of boasting "before our Lord Jesus at his coming" (2:19); and when he describes the scene of Christ's coming (I Thess. 4:16-17). Such a passage obviously denotes an excited expectation of the consummation of history in the very near future. To be sure, Paul adds that no one knows the exact time (I Thess. 5:2; cf. Mk. 13:32), but, nevertheless, one may expect it suddenly and soon (I Thess. 5:3-6).

Paul evidently had preached the nearness of the Parousia so vividly that many of his hearers in Thessalonica either misunderstood him or became so excited about it that they were easily misled by others; for they not only conceived that the Parousia was coming at any moment, but, in fact, that it had already arrived, so that they could afford to live in parasitic idleness (II Thess. 2:1-2; 3:6-13). Yet, even while dealing with this problem, Paul intimated that the Day was not far distant (II Thess. 2:1). In that transitional remark, Paul did not deny the nearness of Christ's coming, but rather assumed that of course they were going to be alive to meet the Lord when he does come.

In I Cor. 1:7-8 Paul says, "as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ; who will sustain you to the end, guiltless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (cf. I Cor. 7:29-31).³⁴ So, also, in Romans, written at the end of his eastern career, he writes, "you know what hour it is, how it is full time now for you to wake from sleep. For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed; the night is far gone, the day is at hand" (Rom. 13:11-12a; cf. 16:20). There is no need, therefore, to make "provision for the flesh, to gratify its desires" (13:14). In Col. 3:6 Paul says, "the wrath of God is coming", which seems to imply, in their lifetime.

Even in Philipppians, possibly the last extant letter that Paul wrote, the Parousia is still eagerly expected. At that time, Paul realized that he himself might have to be sacrificed as a libation (Phil. 2:17) before the final event occurred; yet he claims, "The Lord is at hand" (Phil. 4:5), that is, Christ's coming is apparently still thought to be in the lifetime of Paul's own generation.

Thus, an expectancy of the immediate advent of the Lord is possibly sustained throughout Paul's epistles. If so, then this much of Paul's teaching does not change from the beginning to the end of his known missionary career. Apparent changes in thought merely reflect the varying historical situations to which Paul writes.³⁵

6. The Jews Reject Christ

Paul's Christian picture of the Messiah nevertheless inevitably stood in contrast to the Messiah of Judaism, since Jesus had been crucified by the agency of Judaism. So far as Israel was concerned, he was "the stumbling stone". From his post-conversion vantage point Paul was able to recognize the cause of the Jews'

tragic error. In Rom. 9:33, he quotes from two passages of Isaiah (28:16 and 8:14) to express his new insight into scripture. Isaiah had challenged the Israelites who were fearful of the armies of the north, and who had put their faith in military alliances, in military strength, and in decisions they themselves had made for the security of the state. He had also declared that Israel's true security was in faith in Yahweh, which is the stone set in Zion, as 28:16a indicates--the line of the strophe significantly seized upon by Paul as the key to stumbling or to salvation (Rom. 9:30-32; cf., e.g., Rom. 3:22; Gal. 2:16). Paul, however, changes the stone from "faith in Yahweh" to "faith in Jesus". In addition, Is. 8:14, where Yahweh is "a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel", because the people put their faith in their own works rather than in him, Paul uses to assert that, for a like reason, Christ has become that "stone of stumbling". To Is. 28:16c Paul adds the dative prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ (Rom. 9:33c) as the object of the act of believing, referring back to its antecedent, the stone, i.e., faith in Christ. Yet Paul's purpose in quoting these passages is to underscore the refusal of the Jews to pursue righteousness through faith (9:32), and therefore to accept Christ on faith rather than to rely on their own works in their futile endeavour to fulfil the law. Thus, the stone in Paul's analogy refers both to faith-in-Christ and to Christ himself, even as Is. 8:14 identified the stone with the Lord himself. Over either one, the Jews stumbled.³⁶

When all this is said, it still does not answer a question of fundamental importance, and one especially so for the Jewish Christians in Palestine: why then did not Paul join the Jerusalem Jewish Christians and, like Peter, concentrate on these erring Jews and get them to see the truth of Christ? Indeed, the majority of

scholars, relying on Acts, think that that is just what Paul did, changing his tactics later only after he experienced continued discouragement in that field of endeavour.

Paul, however, went far beyond the above observation of his own and his people's stumbling over Christ. He says, in effect, that they not only stumbled but fell. True, in Rom. 11:11 he denies this; but in v. 15 he asserts it, of course with an important qualification to be examined later. The result of the stumbling was rejection by God from their privileged place as chosen people. Paul would appear to base his interpretation of what took place in the crucifixion on the whole sequence of procedures that transpired first in the Sanhedrin, then in the Roman court, and finally in the execution of the death sentence. The last stage was merely the inevitable climax of earlier intentions and involvements.³⁷ The whole Israelite people were committed in the event that took place. In that event, Jesus was not only condemned as a criminal (and, if the Jews themselves had been able to have carried out the sentence, would have been executed by stoning, Dt. 13:10³⁸), but in the Cross (and this is the crucial point for Paul) the Jews were publicly displaying him by hanging him upon a tree (עֲלֵהוּ עֵץ cf. Dt. 21:22), which Dodd translates as "gibbeting".³⁹ In that act, Jesus was not only cursed by the law and by his fellow countrymen, but also by God himself, "for the hanged man is accursed by God" (ὅτι κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ πάντως κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου LXX, עֲלֵהוּ עֵץ - וְכָל הָעָם יִשְׁמְרוּ מִלֵּבּוֹשׁוֹ מִתְּחִלָּה MT, Dt. 21:23; cf. Gal. 3:13). This time, however, unknown to the suprahuman powers governing the world, and so to their puppets (the officialdom of Israel), God was not a partner in the sentence (cf. I Cor. 12:3). Instead, he was on the victim's side and was turning tables against the supraworldly powers (I Cor.

2:6-8).⁴⁰ The perpetrators of the curse, by depending on works of the law, itself a curse to one who did not obey every law (Gal. 3:10), the keeping of which was an impossibility (3:11), had been trapped by the law into banning from their social group the very one who was the only possible fulfilment of that law (3:13-29; cf. Rom. 10:4), and so the only one who could offer them salvation.⁴¹ Therefore, they had cursed themselves instead (Rom. 11:7-10).

This act on the part of the Jews, as far as Paul was concerned, according to the tone of, and illustrations used in, Rom. 9-11, did not leave the Jewish field very productive for the missionary effort of the church, or even theoretically capable of yielding a significant harvest, except for a remnant (cf. Rom. 9:8, 27-28, 31-33; 11:7-12, 15a, 17-25). For God had deliberately planned this act of gibbeting his Son, by using his chosen people to perpetrate the deed of crucifixion so that the way of salvation might be opened for the Gentiles (11:7-11). Again, the teleological and the eschatological were in the historical moment. Without doubt, Gentiles were coming into the church (9:30-31). Paul himself, therefore, recognized that the Gentile field was open, a fact which he reflects in his interpretation of his resurrection experience (Gal. 1:16). He was also aware that the Gentile field was now the main one from which believers would be drawn "until the full number of the Gentiles come in" (Rom. 11:25; cf. 9:30). Therefore, it seems reasonable to suppose that from the very beginning of his career Paul conceived that his mission was to be to the Gentiles, because from the outset any extensive mission to the Jews, except for a prescribed remnant, had been inexorably, although only temporarily, closed (Rom. 9:27-29; cf. 10:14-21; see especially I Thess. 2:14-16).

The question, however, may still be asked: granted that

initially Paul received a call to missionize the Gentiles, why did he not do as the Jewish Christians expected him to do? That is, when he converted Gentiles to Christ, why did he not make them into Jews at the same time? In that way, he could still be on a Gentile mission, and even venture as far as Spain, while still remaining within Jewish definitions of messianic universalism.

That, for Paul, however, would be a contradiction of the existing conditions just described, because if he were to preach circumcision now, then the ban which since the crucifixion had been imposed on the Jewish way of salvation, and so on the Jewish people and thus on anyone else who entered by that way, would be null and void. That seems to be the significance of his protest in Gal. 5:11, "But if I, brethren, still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted? In that case the stumbling block of the cross has been removed", and the way of salvation would still be by works of the law, and not by faith in Christ (cf. 3:2; 5:1-6).⁴² But now for everyone, Jew and Gentile alike, the only way of salvation is the way of faith in Christ. Gal. 5:11 points to the time when the Jews rejected Christ, and as a direct consequence, when God rejected the Jews. I Thess. 2:14-16 indicates that Paul was cognizant of this at the beginning of his ministry, which further intimates that that is where his mission to the Gentiles was conceived and initiated, and not in any discouragement which he may have experienced later in a mission to the Jews that he carried on for any extended time after his conversion.

Surprisingly enough, in spite of the abundance of optimism for the salvation of Gentiles via proselytism which seems to saturate Judaism, and which seems to shut out any other method of evangelizing the world, Paul still is able to find his approach to

the Gentiles, not through Greek ideals or Roman political ecumenism, but by way of Hebrew scripture. He is a Jew and he came to his Christianity by way of Judaism, not by way of Hellenism. Paul proved from Hebrew scripture (Rom. 9-11) that Christ's rejection meant not only the temporary rejection of the Jews but also the end of Judaism's law as the way of salvation (10:4). He showed it to be God's teleological plan of salvation (I Cor. 2:7-10) perceptible in the protological period of Israel's history (e.g., Rom. 9:6-13, 22-26; 10:19-20; 11:7-10). It was a Hebraic key that opened the door to a Gentile, ecumenical mission (cf. 10:12-13; 11:15a). Furthermore, Paul perceived that the extant expression of that plan was really an extension of the original Hebrew conception that Israel was God's chosen people through whom he would reveal himself to the world, and through whom he would bring salvation to all people. Israel, paradoxically, by her rejection of God's Son, had inadvertently widened the way of entry into the true Israel, God's saved community, the church, and so, in a negative way (which Paul recognizes, cf. Rom. 11:15, 25-26a, 28, 31), Israel still was the chosen one through whom salvation comes to the world.

CHAPTER II

GENERAL PLAN OF PAUL'S MISSIONARY ACTIVITIES

In the preceding chapter it was propounded that as a result of his conversion experience Paul recognized that the Messianic Kingdom was already a reality and that the exalted and reigning Christ was even now proceeding with the work of his realm, and that Paul conceived himself to be an integral part of that activity in that he had been set apart by God even before birth for the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles. The question now to be investigated is how far it can be discovered from his letters how he undertook his task.

For three years, which may not have been entirely spent in Arabia (cf. II Cor. 11:32-33; Gal. 1:17-18a), Paul may have preached in and around Damascus before he went on his first visit to Jerusalem.¹ Then Paul says that he "went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia" (Gal. 1:21). He adds, "Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas" (Gal. 2:1). Paul had to be accurate with his data, the details of which his opponents could otherwise easily disprove.² So fourteen years separate the first meeting with Cephas from Paul's second journey to Jerusalem, according to the natural way of reading his account, taking the number of years mentioned as intervals between the successive events which he mentions in his description of his life in Gal. 1:11-2:14.³

If for the fourteen years after he had made his first visit to Jerusalem Paul worked only in Syria and Cilicia, as many interpret

Gal. 1:21 to mean, then for these years he worked only in fields where many others also laboured, which surely does not harmonize with the tone of his assertion to the Romans (15:20-21),

thus making it my ambition to preach the gospel, not where Christ has already been named, lest I build on another man's foundation, but as it is written, "They shall see who have never been told of him, and they shall understand who have never heard of him";

nor does it correspond with the importance he placed upon his apostolic commission which is evident in Galatians and I and II Corinthians. These two considerations make this interpretation suspect, and require an investigation of Paul's letters to see whether there is any evidence in support of his statement to the Romans, which implies rather that he immediately set out on a vast, ecumenical, missionary programme, and in substantiation of his other claim, in Gal. 1:15-16, that God had set him apart before he was born, and had called him through his grace, and had revealed his Son to him, in order that he "might preach him among the Gentiles".

Both Knox⁴ and Suggs⁵ have argued that when Paul says that he "went into [εἰς] the regions of Syria and Cilicia", he says it in order to prove to the suspicious Galatians that he had nothing more to do with the apostles nor with any of the churches of Judaea (Gal. 1:22). *Εἰς*, with verbs of motion (as here), denotes direction 'to', 'towards', 'into'.⁶ It does not necessarily imply continuation 'through', but neither does it necessarily imply 'rest in' nor any duration of stay in a place unless it is accompanied by a verb signifying 'rest in' or duration of stay.⁷ It goes too far to say with Ogg⁸ that if Paul had been intent on proving his remoteness from Jerusalem he would have named the most distant regions that he had reached, viz., Macedonia and Achaia. To emphasize his point, Paul merely had to give the regional direction of

travel away from Judaea.⁹ The chronology, however, of this period cannot be based upon this verse, and this study will not attempt to do so; but it does allow us to investigate further. Knox's assumption is possible if there are other grounds in Paul's letters for positing an early missionary campaign in Macedonia and Achaia before he went to Jerusalem for the second time fourteen years later. Evidence for what occupied Paul for the next fourteen years will then have to be sought elsewhere. Our intention here will be to enquire if Paul gives direct information, or at least makes allusions, enabling one to discover his movements and the basic motives which determined them.

Did Paul Spend Time in Syria and Cilicia?

Paul remained in Jerusalem for two weeks and while there was closeted with Peter. That conference completed, Paul left Judaea and went on from there to Syria and Cilicia (the geographical order in which he lists these provinces should be noted, Gal. 1:21), and did not return to Jerusalem again for fourteen years. No indication is given by Paul that he did any more than go through these provinces en route to somewhere else; for from the references to Titus--a Greek--in the Galatian account of Paul's journey to Jerusalem, and to Paul's use of him in Achaia according to the Corinthian correspondence, one might gather that before the next event, related in Gal. 2:1, Paul had been as far as Macedonia and Achaia.¹⁰

It is reasonable to suppose that one of the first resolves that Paul made in his Arabian sojourn is the one he pledged himself never knowingly to break, i.e., never to work in another man's territory. Not only does he make this explicit in Romans 15:20-24, but he also implies that this is his principle of missionary ethics when he asserts in II Cor. 10:13-16 that Corinth and, by inference,

the whole of Achaia are his territory, and that the disturbers of the peace are encroaching upon his rightful claim.

Both Syria and Cilicia were already established Christian centres. The tradition that the church began preaching early could be reflected in Q (Mt. 10:7; Lk. 10:9). Other passages, e.g., Mt. 28:18-20, Mk. 13:10, Lk. 24:47, support the possibility of an early missionary work by Hellenist Jewish Christians, though the passages themselves, especially Mt. 28:18-20, may be late in their present form. The actual command, however, may be old.¹¹ If Jesus did give a command to go out and to preach the gospel, it would be strange if no such activity took place until a long time afterward (cf. I Cor. 9:5, 16; Rom. 1:5-7). And such activity is partially confirmed by Paul's own intimations, for no matter at what early date he was converted, after only three years he went to Jerusalem to confer with Peter. The only other person whom he saw there was James, the brother of Jesus. That poses the question, where the others were, if not, as Rengstorff¹² suggests, out on their mission? Also, Paul intimates that it was in the region of Damascus that he persecuted the church, for, he says, "again I returned to Damascus" (Gal. 1:17; cf. v. 22). Thus we may assume that later he may not have been very welcome in that area as a Christian missionary, inasmuch as he was possibly well known to the hostile Jews who lived there, and probably was hated and hunted by his former friends (cf. II Cor. 11:32). At any rate, other missionaries were labouring in these territories, and work in them would not be in keeping with his resolution. Therefore, Suggs is rightly sceptical that Paul pursued any missionary activity of his own in these provinces.¹³ Where, then, was he?

Titus went with Paul to the Jerusalem conference (Gal. 2:1). Except in Paul's account of this conference, Titus is mentioned in

Paul's letters only in II Corinthians (2:13; 7:6, 13, 14; 8:6, 16, 23; 12:18), where he is a worker with Paul in Achaia and Macedonia. So, by deduction from Galatians and from these references in II Corinthians concerning Titus, Paul must have been working in Corinth before the date of the conference long enough to have become well acquainted with Titus, a Greek, who accompanied him to Jerusalem.¹⁴

Although I Cor. 16:19 refers to Prisca and Aquila as resident in Ephesus (cf. I Cor. 16:8), nevertheless, because of the special greeting from them that Paul conveys to the Corinthians here it is reasonable to suppose that these two had at one time been in Corinth and were well known there as friends, and indeed as formerly resident in Corinth. That does not necessarily mean that Paul himself was acquainted with them when they resided in Achaia, but if both Paul and Prisca and Aquila had been in Corinth earlier, this hearty greeting (ἀσπάζεταιται...πολλὰ...) may well reflect a background of mutually shared experiences with the people of Corinth. As, however, they were evidently wealthy or at least well-to-do people, for, like Philemon (v. 2), they had a church in their house (I Cor. 16:19; Rom. 16:5), had "risked their necks"¹⁵ for Paul's life (Rom. 16:4), and Paul and the whole Gentile mission owed them a debt of gratitude (Rom. 16:4), it is quite plausible that they were also successful business people, and as such, it would be reasonable to suppose that they had formerly established themselves in business in Achaia before moving to Ephesus. The question is, when were Prisca, Aquila, and Paul in Corinth?

Ephesus and Corinth were strategic commercial centres of considerable size and importance on the most heavily travelled road between Rome and the East. So, if Paul's claim is correct that he was the first Christian missionary to come all the way to the

Corinthians with the gospel (II Cor. 10:14), and that the first converts were made by him (I Cor. 1:16; 16:15), it would be strange if, in view of the rapidly spreading Christian missionary activity of the early church, Paul arrived at Achaia at a late date, and if no other Christian missionary had ventured as far, and there had not been a single convert there before he arrived. It would be even stranger if Christians who had undoubtedly passed through this territory on their way to Rome where they actively engaged in missionary work, so much so that it provoked riots amongst the Jews so that according to Suetonius (Claudius XXV) and Dio Cassius (LX) Claudius had to issue an edict expelling the Jews from the land,¹⁶ had not previously done some work in Corinth. It is conceivable that Christianity arrived in Rome early; and it is extremely difficult to suppose that these early Christians entirely ignored the land through which they had to pass, and in which they most likely even had to stay for a time while their ship was being hauled across the land bridge, and while ordinary trade took place.

Therefore, inasmuch as Paul made it his policy never to work another missionary's territory, and yet dared to claim Achaia as his rightful field as the first missionary there, implying that all others who were not working with him were intruders and imposters (II Cor. 10:7-18), then he would have to have been in the region very early.¹⁷ The investigation in the previous chapter suggested that Paul was called to go to the Gentiles at the beginning of his ministry. The evidence now further suggests that immediately after conferring with Peter Paul began his ecumenical mission to all nations (ἐν παντί τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Rom. 1:5).

Suggs has contended that Paul began his missionary work in the region of Macedonia at the very outset of his whole preaching

career, and does so on the basis of three passages: Phil. 4:15-16; 1:5; and II Thess. 2:13.¹⁸ In these, he argues, Paul distinctly says that he evangelized Macedonia at the beginning of his missionary career, indeed, at the commencement of the church's extension of its borders beyond the region of its birth. This is a reasonable conclusion from Phil. 4:15-16, "And you Philippians yourselves know that in the beginning of the gospel, when I left Macedonia";¹⁹ and Phil. 1:5, where the Philippians themselves are credited with having been partners with Paul right from the beginning, i.e., from the first day of Paul's total missionary campaign, "thankful for your partnership in the gospel from the first day until now". Paul therefore began his missionary career in Macedonia. II Thess. 2:13 corroborates this testimony with, "because God chose you from the beginning to be saved", i.e., from the beginning of the Christian movement, or as some ancient MSS read, "as the first fruits".²⁰ Paul seems to be saying that the Thessalonians were not only the first converts in his own Gentile mission but also were among the very first in time anywhere, i.e., that they were converted in that time that he could reasonably declare to be "the beginning of the gospel".²¹

If Gaius, upon his accession in 37, made Aretas IV king of Damascus, as some think,²² then this could be the reason why Paul, free to preach until this time, was then hunted by "the governor under King Aretas" (II Cor. 11:32). If so, then Paul's conversion would have been about 34,²³ his flight from Damascus and his first visit to Jerusalem in 37, and, if the above arguments are feasible, his arrival in Macedonia--allowing time for this sequence of events--sometime in 37 or 38.

Reconstruction of a Plausible Plan of Activity

There is sufficient ground, therefore, for taking as a working hypothesis that Paul set out from Jerusalem immediately after his first visit there, heading westward. He spent little time in Syria, Cilicia, Phrygia, Galatia, Asia, or any of the eastern . . . provinces. Instead, he travelled on, observing that missionary work was already being done in the successive areas, until he came to Macedonia and at once began his work in Philippi.²⁴

How long Paul's ministry lasted in the upper Macedonian region before he journeyed to Corinth is not known. There are, however, intimations in Thessalonians and Philippians which may help in deciding this question. The letters themselves were written considerably later than his departure from that territory for Athens and Corinth in the south, because when he wrote, there were already many believers in Achaia (I Thess. 1:7). As has been noted above, this was solely the result of Paul's own missionary activities.

A clue to its duration may be given in the words, "you became an example to all the believers in Macedonia and in Achaia. For not only has the word of the Lord sounded forth from you in Macedonia and Achaia, but your faith in God has gone forth everywhere" (I Thess. 1:7-8).²⁵ Some of this work could have been that of Timothy who, according to this same letter (I Thess. 3:2), had been sent there; but inasmuch as this is the first recorded journey by Timothy back to the region, one may gather from these passages that the extent of the work intimated here was mainly due to work done while Paul himself was in the region.

Again, in I Thess. 4:10, Paul says, "indeed you do love all the brethren throughout Macedonia" (ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ), the basic meaning of ὅλη being "whole", "entire", "complete". How extensive

his work was in Macedonia during this initial period is the question. By "throughout Macedonia" he cannot be referring merely to the church as represented in Thessalonica and Philippi. Further, it has always been assumed (on the basis of Acts 16:12-40) that Paul was hustled out of Philippi soon after arriving, yet that church alone became his partner "from the first day" (Phil. 1:5), and the only one that shared wholeheartedly in his mission throughout his ministry (4:15, if this section at least of the letter was written to them after his arrest in Jerusalem). Such devotion is hardly established among people overnight. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that there was a ministry of some length in Philippi before he was forced out, an experience that is perhaps referred to in I Thess. 2:2. In these passages Paul is using regional terms: "throughout Macedonia", "everywhere", "Achaia and Macedonia", and there is no basis in his letters to surmise that when he uses a regional term he means a city.²⁶ When he is ready to leave the East for good, he writes to the Corinthians concerning his plan to visit them after "passing through Macedonia" (I Cor. 16:5). Deissmann²⁷ takes this to mean travelling as far as Illyricum along the Via Egnatia, the principal Roman military highway to the East. In the present passage, Paul may be indicating that he has already begun a planned missionary programme extending across Macedonia along this Egnatian highway, upon the eastern Macedonian end of which Thessalonica lies.

Closely connected with this is Paul's own observation in Phil. 4:14-16 concerning his work in the area:

Yet it was kind of you to share my trouble. And you Philippians yourselves know that in the beginning of the gospel, when I left Macedonia, no church entered into partnership with me in giving and receiving except you only; for even in Thessalonica you sent me help once and again.

Even such a brief statement stands in the way of an assumption that

he fled the province soon after going there, for, would he have said, "no church . . . except you only" if, except for the Thessalonian church next to be mentioned, the Philippian church was the only church that could possibly have helped, since it was the only church in the whole of Macedonia? "Except you only" implies, "I had several". Indeed, that is what makes the Philippian congregation so outstanding in his memory. If, as a result of his missionary efforts, they and the Thessalonians were the only two churches existing so far, he could hardly have singled them out in this way. So it seems reasonable to assume that he worked, as he later said, "throughout Macedonia".

Paul remained in Thessalonica for a considerable time,²⁸ at least long enough for the Philippians to send him help "once and again", the number uncounted.²⁹ Plausibly he spent two or three years developing this area before he left it in competent enough hands to feel that it was safe for him to make his way south toward Achaia in order to expand his missionary activities.

From Macedonia Paul presumably travelled southward along the eastern coast until he came to Athens where he remained for a time, perhaps forcibly detained. In I Thess. 2:17 he says, "we were bereft of you, brethren, for a short time". He is writing about a past period in which he and his companions had endeavoured to return to Thessalonica "again and again--but Satan hindered us" (v. 18). Finally, when absence from the Thessalonians was unbearable, Paul and Silvanus sent Timothy to establish that congregation in their faith while they themselves "were willing to be left behind at Athens alone" (3:1).

What Satan was doing Paul does not say. There is a possible hint in 3:4, "For when we were with you, we told you beforehand that

we were to suffer affliction; just as it has come to pass, and as you know."³⁰ In II Cor. 11:23-25 Paul, boasting of his afflictions and comparing his credentials with those of any of the other apostles encroaching upon his work, mentions imprisonment. An imprisonment for preaching an illicit religion in Athens might possibly be included as one of these afflictions; and the punishment to which he was sentenced as one of the times when he was beaten with rods. Paul does not say; yet, it was Satan who had detained him in Athens.³¹ In the meantime, distraught by anxiety about problems in Thessalonica, Paul and Silvanus sent Timothy to represent them in working out the Macedonians' problems. Later, after Timothy had returned with news, Paul wrote to the Thessalonians from Corinth (I Thess. 3:6).

Thus Paul began his work in Achaia, baptizing Stephanas, winning a church in his house, going about in the region of Achaia establishing congregations (cf. I Cor. 1:14-17; 16:15; II Cor. 10:13-14; I Thess. 1:7-8). Some scholars, however, are of the opinion that Paul did not evangelize the whole of the Achaian peninsula, but only the general region in and around its chief commercial city, Corinth.³² They argue that since he was interested in a representative type of mission to the nations, he went only to the main centres, from which the message could then be carried into the neighbouring communities and to the rest of the respective province by helpers and by local Christian witnessing. They also seem to intimate that since the route through Corinth from the East to the West was one of the most important routes connecting Rome with her eastern empire, and since Paul's goal was Rome and the West, and inasmuch as the road to Rome was along this route, he therefore developed his churches along it rather than into the southern

interior. The fact that Cenchreae (Rom. 16:1), which lies on the north-eastern coast of Achaia, not very far from Corinth, is the only other Achaian community named by Paul besides Corinth, and that he himself addressed letters to Corinth as though it were the only organized church in the province (cf. I Cor. 1:2; II Cor. 1:1), would seem to support this opinion.

The possibility cannot be ruled out, however, that Paul may have meant by "Achaia" (e.g., in Rom. 15:26; I Cor. 16:15; II Cor. 1:1; 9:2) the whole territory implied by the name, even as there is strong indication in I Thess. 1:7-8 that when he referred in the same sentences to Achaia and Macedonia he meant by Macedonia far more than just Thessalonica and Philippi. Even his wish expressed to the Corinthians that they should extend his field beyond their own borders (II Cor. 10:15) does not preclude the possibility that he himself had already gone to other places south (poor military roads would hardly stand in the way of Paul going on foot) and west of Corinth. He claimed the whole of Achaia as his territory (cf. II Cor. 1:1, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, and II Cor. 11:10, ἐν τοῖς κλίμασιν τῆς Ἀχαΐας).

How long Timothy was away in Macedonia before he returned to Paul and Silvanus in Achaia is not known. The church in Thessalonica had been suffering severe persecution from their own countrymen and so became "imitators of the churches of God in Christ Jesus which are in Judea" (I Thess. 2:14), and Timothy had gone there to establish them in their faith (I Thess. 3:2). This probably took time. Also, he was away long enough to be able to report to Paul and Silvanus that they were always (πάντοτε) remembered kindly (I Thess. 3:6), which, as an adverb of time, would hint at a stay of some duration (as well as having the sense of "unanimous", i.e., at

all times, by everyone). This, together with Paul's references to "all the believers in . . . Achaia" already reporting how the Thessalonians had come over from paganism (I Thess. 1:7-9), strengthens the assumption that Paul himself had been at work for a considerable time in Achaia before Timothy returned to him with news about the Thessalonians' love for and loyalty to him.³³

It has been assumed above that Paul went directly from Athens to Corinth. That he did so can be surmised, it is true, only from I Thess. 3:1 where he mentions Athens as though he were no longer there, "we were willing to be left behind at Athens alone". Thus the majority of scholars place the origin of this letter in Corinth.³⁴

Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians may have been necessitated not by the readers' misunderstanding of his first letter's references to the Parousia, I Thess. 4:13-18, but by their misunderstanding of an event news of which plausibly reached Macedonia shortly after that letter had arrived, an event which produced quite drastic economic and sociological consequences in Thessalonica (II Thess. 2:2; 3:6-15). For if Paul's ministry in Macedonia commenced "in the beginning of the gospel", and if his ministry in Achaia had to be early in order for him to be the first missionary in the area, then it is feasible to suggest that the events underlying Paul's discussion of the Parousia in II Thess. 2:1-12 were Gaius' assassination and the accession of Claudius, which the Thessalonians had misinterpreted as signs of the Parousia. Paul then had to straighten out their second misinterpretation of events by again explaining (cf. v. 5, a reference to the first) the nature of the last things (II Thess. 2:1-12). By informing them that the Parousia was being delayed, he also removed their ground for

abstaining from work and for economic irresponsibility. The similarity of style, interests, and theme demand a date close to the first letter to them. There are, therefore, substantial grounds for positing it as his second extant letter, also sent from Corinth.

II Thess. 2:1-12 provides a possible clue for pegging Paul's Macedonian ministry to an absolute date. Since this letter may be prompted by the stir caused by the news of Gaius' murder and Claudius' accession in the winter of 41, and since the discussion of the Parousia in this passage is evidently related to the discussion Paul had with the Thessalonians when he worked amongst them (cf. v. 5), it seems plausible that that which prompted Paul's first explanation of coming events was the original stir caused by Gaius' order to set up his statue in the temple in Jerusalem, the event which the Thessalonians had first misinterpreted. If so, then verse 5 indicates that Paul was in Macedonia at that time, i.e., in the summer of 40. He must have left Macedonia shortly afterwards if sufficient time is to be allowed for the events which followed up to the time of writing II Thessalonians, which was Paul's response to the news he had received sometime in 41 about the effect that the news of Claudius' accession was having upon the Thessalonians.³⁵

There is of course no way of knowing how many years one should allow for Paul's personal work in the successive areas of his missionary campaign. But if Paul had worked in Macedonia for approximately two or three years, then his work would have begun there about 37 or 38. Again one can only conjecture how many years Paul laboured in Achaia before he left Corinth for Ephesus. The next data, however, supplying clues relating to the chronology of Paul's missionary activities come from the period directly following the so-called Jerusalem conference.

In Galatians Paul gives his own testimony about the conference in Jerusalem to which he, Barnabas, and Titus went (Gal. 2:1-10).³⁶ The meeting was hardly an officially summoned conference. Rather, since he says that he went up by revelation, it was a private consultation decided upon, presumably by Paul, on the spur of the moment. He and his partners went on the long journey for the sole purpose of laying "before them (but privately before those who were of repute) the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, lest somehow I should be running or had run in vain" (Gal. 2:2). Some false brethren had slipped in (2:4) and tried to interfere, but to no avail. It was a private discussion between Paul and his partners on the one side, and "those who were of repute" on the other. An integral part of the agreement which issued from that meeting was the provision that the poor should be remembered, *μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν*, to which Paul adds his personal comment, "which very thing I was eager to do" (*ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι*, Gal. 2:10). Galatians was written after that event occurred. When had Paul been in Galatia?

Knox has pointed out that the offering, which followed the Jerusalem meeting, most likely took place within a relatively short time.³⁷ That judgment is corroborated by II Cor. 8:10, for there Paul encouraged the Corinthians "to complete what a year ago" they "began not only to do but to desire". Paul will then have begun the fund campaign immediately after he had arrived back from his visit to Jerusalem. At the time of the writing of II Cor. 8, he was on the last lap of the journey to Corinth, whence he was to depart for Jerusalem the following spring (cf. I Cor. 16:3-9; II Cor. 1:16; Rom. 15:25). As has already been suggested, Paul began his major missionary work in Macedonia. Then he went to Achaia. There is no

time for an extended Galatian missionary activity after the Jerusalem meeting, and certainly none after his return with the offering to Jerusalem. That being the case, he must have missionized Galatia not long before the Jerusalem conference.

Within Galatians itself there is evidence which might indicate in which of the years before the conference this activity occurred. In 1:6 Paul says, "I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of Christ". Language of this kind can hardly go with a long lapse of time between his initial work in Galatia and the writing of the letter. This would accord with the chronology thus far developed. In other words, Paul must have worked in that area not only some time after he finished his missionary residence in Achaia, but also not long before he went to Jerusalem for this private consultation.

In Gal. 3:1 Paul chastises his readers, "O foolish Galatians!" Here, as many have noted,³⁸ he used an ethnic term, not a regional one. People in the wider, more inclusive Roman political province would not be designated ethnically "Galatians". People proud of their tribal heritage and connections would not be flattered by being called by an erroneous ethnic name, and Paul, proud of his own Jewish heritage (Phil. 3:5), would not be likely to err in this delicate matter with others. Therefore, it seems reasonably certain that the recipients of the letter were the true Galatians of original Galatia.

Even if Paul sought his first contacts in his mission to the Gentiles amongst proselytes and God-fearers in local synagogues, and from there, with the help of his converts, branched out into the Gentile neighbourhood, Galatia seems to have been one place where this did not occur. In 4:8-9a Paul reminds his Galatian readers

that before they knew God (meaning, in this context, before they were converted by Paul's preaching), they were in bondage to pagan deities. That is, they were Gentiles fresh from idolatry.

Also, in 4:13-14 Paul says, "You know it was because of a bodily ailment that I preached the gospel to you at first; and though my condition was a trial to you, you did not scorn or despise me, but received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus." At that time their sympathy knew no bounds, their devotion no price (v. 15). Thus it seems that it was by force of circumstances rather than by basic planning that Paul was encouraged to go to this inland plateau country of Galatia, maybe as far north as its capital at Ancyra, for a rest cure of some kind. The nature of his illness or bodily ailment that required this retreat from coastal regions is not known; but that he went for some reason of health is tolerably clear. While there, he lost no opportunity to preach the gospel to a Gentile people who eagerly listened, became disciples, and ministered gratefully to his needs.

The wording of this same passage suggests that he had visited them at least twice before he wrote the letter, "it was because of a bodily ailment that I preached the gospel to you at first" (4:13). "At first" may imply at least a second visit after the initial one.³⁹ It may also imply that the second visit was not long ago. Yet the church was well enough established to be a sizable organization, the letter being addressed not to a single congregation but "to the churches of Galatia" (1:2), i.e., several congregations in this northern ethnic area. These presumably were close enough together to receive and to pass on a letter addressed to them collectively, which would hardly seem practicable if, as has often been suggested, they were scattered over the province of Galatia. In his

first campaign in this area he could have started many cells, and from these, thriving congregations could have grown up fairly rapidly. If Paul wrote Galatians soon after his return from Jerusalem, then some date a short time before the conference would satisfy the exegetical requirements of 1:6 and 4:13 as far as the first visit is concerned.⁴⁰

As has already been noted, Paul was interested in working whole areas, using main centres like Thessalonica for Macedonia, and Corinth for Achaia from which to operate. Therefore, the next problem to be examined is, where after Corinth Paul's headquarters were, if, before the second visit to Jerusalem, he had been working in at least part of the region now called Turkey? Where did he come from in order to go to Galatia?

There are references in Paul's letters which help to solve this problem. First, in I Cor. 16:19 he states, "The churches of Asia send greetings". This letter is sent to the Corinthians after his return from his visit to the leaders "of repute" in the Jerusalem church. This may be deduced from the directions that he gives concerning the contributions for the saints (16:1-4), which offering was agreed upon at that meeting (Gal. 2:10). As there was only a relatively short period of time between that visit and his final return to Jerusalem, there would hardly have been time within that period to establish substantial working relations with a series of churches across Asia. These connections, therefore, were established prior to his second visit. Also, in a letter sent about one year later to the Corinthians, Paul refers to the "affliction we experienced in Asia" (II Cor. 1:8).

It is to be noted that Ephesians (which most scholars today think is not Pauline) has several passages which sound as though

Paul was personally unknown to the church in Ephesus (Eph. 1:15; 3:2-4; 5:1). Snape⁴¹ sees Apollos (who in Paul's letters is met with in I Cor. 1:12; 3:4, 5, 6, 22; 4:6, and 16:12) as working in Ephesus before Paul arrived, and as labouring there as a representative of Alexandrian Christianity.

In relation to these passages, Paul's strict maxim should again be remembered, "making it my ambition to preach the gospel, not where Christ has already been named, lest I build on another man's foundation" (Rom. 15:20). If the assumption, therefore, that Paul did not missionize Syria and Cilicia is correct, and if it is right to assume that he merely passed through these eastern provinces en route to Macedonia where he set up his first base of operations, then up to this point in his career, Paul strictly observed this principle. If he had already broken it, he would hardly have dared to make the bold claim that he did to the Romans. If he had trespassed on the Ephesian territory of Apollos, with whom he had cordial relations, he would hardly have dared to exhort the Corinthians to remember whose children they were (I Cor. 4:14-15), to recall who first came to them with the gospel, who baptized Stephanas (I Cor. 1:16; 16:15; II Cor. 10:14), who fathered them in Christ (I Cor. 4:15). He would hardly have dared to assert that Corinth was his territory and belonged to no one else (II Cor. 10:14-15). Indeed, it does not seem possible that one who was so zealous about such a maxim would brazenly take over in the territory of another man, and that man a friend whom Paul used as a helper in his own field of operations (I Cor. 16:12; cf. I Cor. 3:5-10).

This, however, does not rule out Ephesus as a place of residence for Paul, as a base for guiding missionary operations in other fields, as a site for labouring for his daily sustenance, or

as a centre for a co-operative missionary enterprise (cf. I Cor. 15:32; 16:8). From Ephesus Paul wrote I Corinthians (cf. I Cor. 16:8), in which he included greetings from former Corinthian residents who had now evidently established themselves in Ephesus, namely, Prisca and Aquila (I Cor. 16:19). In connection with them, it is important to remember that Paul reminded the Corinthians that he had always insisted upon being a burden to no one, that he toiled for his living (cf. I Cor. 9:12b, 15, 18; II Cor. 11:9, 20-21, 27; I Thess. 2:5-9; II Thess. 3:7-8), and that only rarely--and then only from the Philippians--had he accepted financial support for his work (II Cor. 11:8-9; cf. Phil. 4:10-18). So, in the light of what Paul says about them in other places, there may be sufficient grounds for assuming a business relationship between them.⁴² If that is the case, then, since Prisca and Aquila were established in Ephesus, this city would have been a natural place for Paul to work in to earn his living,⁴³ and at the same time to use it as a base for operations whether in Asia or elsewhere (cf. I Cor. 16:1, 5, 8, 12, 19; II Cor. 12:18). So, too, after his visit to Jerusalem, it would have been the natural place to return to, from which he could then promote his collection. Paul's letters, however, indicate that in some way he himself was also identified with the churches in Asia (cf. I Cor. 16:19).

Two letters, Colossians and Philemon, shed some light upon this period in Paul's ministry. After coming across from Achaia to Asia, Paul in some way assisted in the region to the east of Ephesus, i.e., in Colossae, Laodicea, and Hierapolis. Evidently, work in Asia gave him considerable trouble from the authorities, and it is possible that one or two of his imprisonments (cf. II Cor. 11:23) occurred there (cf. I Cor. 15:32; II Cor. 1:8-10). For reasons

which have been advanced, especially by Duncan, Colossians and Philemon could be from this period and not from a later confinement in far away Rome.⁴⁴

There are some observations that can be made from these two letters which may help to determine their relative place within this Pauline chronology.

1. In Colossians, Epaphras--of Colossae, Laodicea, and Hierapolis--has reported to Paul about conditions at Colossae (1:7-8; 4:12-13). In Colossians he is not mentioned as a fellow prisoner, while Aristarchus is (4:10). In Philemon, however, Epaphras is called a "fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus" (v. 23), while Aristarchus is referred to as a fellow worker (v. 24).

2. In Philemon, Onesimus, the subject of the letter, is with Paul, whether as a fellow prisoner or not is not said.⁴⁵ He is being sent back to Philemon (v. 12); Paul does not say in whose custody, if in anyone's. In Colossians, Onesimus is travelling with Tychicus (4:7-9). Paul does not say that Onesimus is in the custody of Tychicus.

3. In Colossians Paul refers to Onesimus as "the faithful and beloved brother, who is one of yourselves" (4:9).

4. According to the Latin Marcionite Prologues to Paul's epistles, Colossians is written from Ephesus, Philemon from Rome.

The usual explanation for the nearly parallel conditions presented by these two letters, and so the usual solution of the problems posed by these passages, is that both letters were written at the same time, and that both accompanied Tychicus and Onesimus to Colossae. This may be correct. To accommodate this interpretation, however, the references to fellow prisoners is spiritualized; but why other zealous fellow workers are not so termed is never

indicated.⁴⁶ Also, the aorist, ἔπεμψα (Col. 4:8) is taken as an epistolary aorist, and it is assumed that Tychicus is the bearer of the letter to the Colossians, that Onesimus is in his custody, and that he is being returned to his owner with the accompanying letter to Philemon. The reference to "the faithful and beloved brother" (Ccl. 4:9) is usually ignored or glossed over as a bit of Pauline graciousness in reintroducing the returning, converted slave into his home environment. This explanation also overlooks the fact that somehow Marcion understood that these two letters came from two different imprisonments of Paul.

There is another explanation that would fit the data and would not need a spiritualizing interpretation of terms to explain the discrepancies. That is, the letter to Philemon could have been written first, and that to the Colossians later, under nearly the same conditions, i.e., either within the same imprisonment taken to be of longer duration before Paul's case was heard and disposed of,⁴⁷ or plausibly during another imprisonment after more civil disturbances had erupted, and he and one of his same fellow workers reimprisoned. In the meantime, Philemon could have gladly released Onesimus from slavery and could have sent him back to Paul to become a worker with him in the Christian mission; for in Colossians Paul referred to him as "the faithful and beloved brother, who is one of yourselves" (Col. 4:9). If "faithful" referred to his Christian service, or even to his state as a returning slave, it would scarcely be a term appropriate for an untested, newly converted, runaway slave.

Whatever the solution to that problem may be, it should be noted that though the Colossians had not seen Paul's face (Col. 2:1), yet in Philemon Paul wrote to a person who was evidently one of the

chief citizens of that city and of the Christian community there, and he wrote as one on very intimate terms with a devoted friend, to whom he could say, "to say nothing of your owing me even your own self" (v. 19). This remark sounds as though Paul himself had converted Philemon. Onesimus, too, may have known Paul in some way or other, and for this reason have sought him out. In any case, Paul must have done some kind of Christian work in these Asian churches, in connection with which he enjoyed some special relationship.

The Galatian ministry and Paul's affliction that possibly caused him to retire to this remote area have already been referred to. Much speculation has been offered as to the nature of the malady which, though repellent, won so much sympathy from the Gentile, pagan people. One can only speculate and merely offer another hypothesis. Inasmuch as all his ministry evidently emanated now from Asia with Ephesus as a centre; and since there are grounds for suspecting that he endured imprisonment there, and possibly a lengthy imprisonment; and inasmuch as in I Cor. 15:32 and II Cor. 1:8-10 he tells about terrible afflictions that he suffered in Asia, and in II Cor. 11:23-25, about many beatings by the lash (forty times save one for each beating); and because this punishment was meted out by the Jewish synagogue on religious grounds and not by a Roman court, beatings that left the back and sides, where the flail curled around the body, a bloody pulp, during the infliction of which, executed with full strength, victims often died before the last blow was struck, could not the malady have been the result of one such terrible ordeal? And could not one of those dreadful occasions have driven Paul (for after that excruciating experience he would be a repellent sight for a long time) into temporary and painful exile in some distant, remote region to heal? And may not a non-Jewish

people, who had no sympathy for Jewish religious law, feel compassion for one so brutally treated? And would he not select a region less frequented by Jews? Or it could have been the same, but as a result of a Roman, civil flailing with rods. Galatians would hardly condone this treatment either, especially when inflicted on someone by their own conqueror. The conditions are not known; this is simply a conjecture. The converts, however, did everything possible to tend to his needs (Gal. 4:12-15).⁴⁸ As has been previously argued, Paul's Galatian ministry commenced not long before the writing of Galatians, sometime shortly before his second journey to Jerusalem, which, according to the chronology suggested in this thesis, and on the eleven year method of reckoning the date of this journey, occurred in 48 or 49, or on the fourteen year method, in 51 or 52.

On their way back to Ephesus from Jerusalem, Paul, Barnabas, and presumably Titus stopped in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) long enough for them, and for Peter who came later, to have table fellowship with the church there.⁴⁹ During that occasion, messengers came from James and disrupted the fellowship over the problem of Jews eating with Gentiles. This incident, however, probably took little time out of their return journey to Asia, where Paul immediately set about fulfilling his part in the agreed task of providing an offering of relief for the poor in Jerusalem.⁵⁰

While en route back to Ephesus, Paul conceivably revisited Galatia and set before them the idea of the collection with instructions on how to proceed in the matter, for he says in I Cor. 16:1, "Now concerning the contribution for the saints: as I directed the churches of Galatia, so you also are to do." To be sure, he could have communicated this by letter, as in this passage he is now doing

to the Corinthians; but, as was noted earlier, Paul visited Galatia at least twice. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the second occasion was on this return journey from Jerusalem, at which time he communicated the directives concerning the offering.⁵¹

Another reason why this visit to Galatia should be seen as taking place at this time is that at this point in his career Paul presumably felt he had finished his work in this whole area east of Rome, i.e., finished it in the sense that his own physical presence and direction were no longer needed (cf. Rom. 15:19). Before leaving, however, he evidently wished to make one last tour of the entire region, with a personal appearance in every church for which he was responsible in order to tie things together, to give final instructions to churches and helpers, to set in motion the contribution for the saints, and to organize the machinery for its final distribution to Jerusalem (I Cor. 16:1-6; II Cor. 8:1-7, 18-19), after which he himself would go on to Rome and beyond, to Spain, the western end of the Gentile, Roman world. On the way back from Jerusalem, he will have begun this final organizational programme by revisiting Galatia.⁵²

Once back in Ephesus, Paul would undoubtedly have lost no time in informing the churches of Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia about the offering. At first, envoys like Timothy and Titus may have carried the word to them and instructed them in the procedure. Paul must have acted quickly, for if he arrived back in the autumn of that year and immediately made contact with the Corinthians, possibly in a letter only allusions to which are now extant in the canonical I Corinthians, then it was to be the very next Pentecost when he planned to leave from Ephesus (I Cor. 16:5-8) for Macedonia, from which place the following autumn he wrote II Cor. 8, which was one

year after he began the collection campaign (II Cor. 8:10).⁵³ Without doubt, during this time he still needed to work at his trade in order to earn his living, and in order to raise capital for his Macedonian visit and for his projected journey to Spain; for although he may have hoped Rome would share in the mission (Rom. 15:24), he may nevertheless have endeavoured to accumulate enough reserve to maintain a cherished independence for his missionary movements.

During this one year troubles began in Galatia and in Corinth, as his letters testify. When Paul wrote I Cor. 16:5-9, he intended not to leave Ephesus until the following Pentecost, "for a wide door for effective work" had opened to him. Somewhere in the sequence of correspondence between Paul and Corinth, bad news evidently came back to him from Corinth (cf. I Cor. 4:19), probably in the spring sometime after the seaway had opened for travel, which forced him to make a hurried journey there. It ended in a rout. This is the painful visit (II Cor. 2:1).⁵⁴ For some reason, he suffered ill treatment at their hands and, much upset, he arrived back in Ephesus and immediately dispatched his severe letter, II Cor. 10-13. What had actually happened Paul does not say.

It is important to note that after this painful visit Paul did not dare to go back to Corinth again for a considerable time (II Cor. 2:1-13; 7:5-16), not until he had received reassuring news of a decided change in the situation, for which he was so extremely anxious, that he could not even await Titus' return to Troas, but had to rush on to meet him in Macedonia in order to hear the sooner. Then after hearing the welcome news, he did not revisit Corinth until after he had finished visiting the Macedonian churches from east to west, "through Macedonia" (I Cor. 16:5), as far as Illyricum (Rom. 15:19),⁵⁵ possibly returning to Corinth via Nicopolis. Marxsen

places the writing of II Cor. 1:3-2:13; 7:5-16 in Macedonia, to be followed by the one (or two) "collection letters" (II Cor. 8 and 9) filled with instructions and appeals pertaining to the offering for Jerusalem.⁵⁶

Paul then arrived in Corinth in the autumn of this same year and spent the winter with his reconciled church (I Cor. 16:6; cf. II Cor. 1:15-16; 9:4-5). No further trouble broke out. Then followed the journey to Jerusalem which is announced in his letter to the Romans (15:25), written during this last stay in Corinth (cf. Rom. 15:25-26). Since approximately two years separate Paul's second from his third journey to Jerusalem, the date of this third journey may tentatively be set at 50 or 51, or 53 or 54, depending upon whether one uses the eleven year method or the fourteen year method for reckoning these dates.

CHAPTER III

AN ECUMENICAL CHURCH IN EVERY COMMUNITY

Paul's Activity Among the Gentiles

The way is now open for a further investigation of the meaning of Paul's call to be an apostle "among the Gentiles" (ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Gal. 1:16). The general view has been that Paul meant by this designation of himself that his mission was to ethnic Gentiles alone, and that after a certain point, the second meeting in Jerusalem, it was not at all directed to Jews. This view may be arrived at either through an examination of the language involved (ἐθνη, etc.) or by a consideration of Paul's theology as a whole, and this has generally involved both the use of Acts as a primary source and the use of a certain chronology for Paul's letters. Here, however, the intention is to proceed by relying only on Paul's letters as a primary source and on the basis of the chronology suggested in the previous chapter, and by starting not so much from his theology in general as from his missionary practice in the field and his pastoral care of the churches in so far as these are evidenced in his letters. The question then is, to whom did Paul go?

Did the people to whom Paul went ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν include Jews? In the Mediterranean world there were infiltrated over the whole area hundreds of thousands of Jews. Some scholars have estimated the population of the Diaspora to have been "between 4,000,000 and 6,000,000 perhaps even 7,000,000 souls". Strabo asserts that there was hardly a place in the world where the Jews

were not living.¹

The question then is, would the Christian Paul, who was called to be an apostle to the Gentiles, who himself was a former persecutor of the church, who from his own personal experience knew the hostility of the Jews to Christ and to the movement continued by his disciples, mean by ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν that he intended to move directly into the enemy's camp? As far as his letters are concerned, the assertion that he went to the synagogues can only be made by inference. Deissmann,² basing himself upon Acts and arguing that Paul would naturally go to the synagogue, asks, "how otherwise could the frequent punishments be explained which he suffered at the hands of the synagogue authorities?"

The significance of Deissmann's question in relation to the problem of the ecumenical scope of Paul's missionary programme can be better appreciated, not on the basis of Acts, nor merely on Paul's references to his Jewish beatings, but by understanding how he may have become involved in the legal machinery of his people. Two observations about the Diaspora need to be made. First, the college of elders in every Jewish community dealt with both civil and religious matters, there being virtually no separation of the two in the theocratic society of post-exilic Judaism. This council of elders held in its hands the power of judgment, even to the extent of the penalty of flogging, over members of the Jewish congregation. In purely Jewish communities, since the synagogue was an integral part of its life, the council of elders for civil affairs was the same as the body of elders for the synagogue. Only in mixed areas, as in Gentile lands, did the synagogue have a council of elders of its own. And even there Roman law permitted the Jews civil jurisdiction over their own people, so that the council of elders had power

over matters even outside the synagogue in situations which concerned Jews. Such matters were deemed religious and to affect the congregation of Israel, whose limits were not the walls of the synagogue, but the whole community.³

Second, wherever the Jewish people went, they tended to settle in their own districts, a separate quarter of a town. Of course, it was natural for them to seek out those who were of their own in culture, religion, and language, if only for companionship; but it was especially so with them, since over a long period of time they had become welded into a compact ethnic group by the forces of history and by the strong ties of solidarity of kinship. This is perceptible in all levels from the primary family unit right through successively broader groupings of clan, tribe, and nation, and in Deutero-Isaiah, even to an ultimate solidarity of the peoples of the earth. Paul reflects this strong feeling of solidarity in his own declaration, "circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew born of Hebrews" (Phil. 3:5).

Therefore, as a Jew, Paul would not have to enter any synagogue to preach his gospel in order to be confronted by Jewish law. He had merely to associate himself with the Jewish quarter of a town, gather a few proselytes or some God-fearers around himself and teach them heresies, to be challenged. Indeed, if there were other Jews about, he would not even have to be in the Jewish area of the city. Paul could not escape the Jewish claim that he, a Jew, was subject everywhere to their jurisdiction. So, as a Jew promulgating an unlawful view of Judaism, even claiming that he was making Gentiles into true Israelites, descendants of Abraham, without requiring them to submit to the initiatory rite of circumcision and

without demanding that they be subject to the Torah before bringing them into the Jewish community, would be enough for him to be tried and punished without ever entering a synagogue (cf. Acts 10:28). Thus the fact that he incurred such punishment cannot in itself be used as an argument for the supposition that he went to the synagogues to carry on his mission.

When Paul says that he was called ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Gal. 1:16), is τὰ ἔθνη to be interpreted ethnically, i.e., the Gentiles, or geographically, i.e., the nations? The theological argument running through his letters bases his mission upon the election of the Gentiles to be children of Abraham (Gal. 3:29; cf. Rom. 9) without the necessity of circumcision (Gal. 5:2-6) or the observance of the Torah (Gal. 5:1, 3). So the question is not, did Paul include Gentiles in his mission, for it is obvious that he did; but rather, just how ecumenical was his mission? Did he include Jews?

In relation to this problem, some have drawn conclusions from the presence or absence of references in his epistles to places of worship, but these conclusions are not firmly based. Did Paul then go to synagogues? He himself never says so in his letters. This, however, could be accidental. He does refer to some Christians as having churches in their homes (Rom. 16:5; I Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phlm. 2).⁴ It should be noted, however, that Paul's references to "the church in their house" are only in relation to Asian churches, and that such churches, therefore, are probably not Pauline at all, but rather the result of work done by Apollos; at least they are located in that territory. Even the references in Romans and I Corinthians to the church in the house of Aquila and Prisca are not made about Aquila and Prisca while they resided in

Corinth, but when they were living either in Ephesus or in Rome. The lack of references to churches in homes in Pauline areas may also, however, be accidental.

On the other hand, the early church, even in Pauline areas, had a great deal of the family character about it, which is reflected in the terms used for it, e.g., "household of faith" (Gal. 6:10; cf. Rom. 8:14-17, 29), which in turn suggests that certain elements of its worship were not practised in the synagogue, but either in homes or in some other room adequate for the purpose. Thus the communion service, with its rite in which only members could participate, would exclude non-Christian Jews or Gentiles. This rite was part of a common meal which in itself suggests a home or some other private room, rather than a public synagogue. As Paul says in I Cor. 1:16, whole households became Christians together. Such an occurrence would include not only immediate members of the family, but also all those who served as slaves, those who were in the employ of the head of the household (e.g., possibly those working for Prisca and Aquila), all tenants, and perhaps even friendly neighbours (cf. Acts 10:24, 33, 44, 48; 11:14). Dodd compares this with the Roman familia; but it is also typically Hebraic, solidarity being especially observable in Jewish family units (cf. Abraham, see Gen. 14:14). Such households could well become, as Dodd says, "a unit in the Church". There are indications that the Palestinian Christians met in their own places of worship, such as their own homes (Acts 2:46; 5:42; 10:24; 11:12), the "upper room" (Acts 1:13-14), and the home of Mary (Acts 12:12). Several Jewish groups in Jerusalem had their own synagogues for worship and instruction according to their nationality (Acts 6:9), so Christians could well have had theirs (cf. James 2:2). The word, συναγωγή, "synagogue", being a

translation of the earlier Hebrew $\overline{\text{קָהָל}}$, or congregation of Israel, signifies part of the corporate body of Israel. Inasmuch as the early Gentile Christians thought of themselves as incorporated into the true Israel (Rom. 11:17-18), it would follow that even their house meetings would naturally be thought of as a continuation of the spirit of the ideal Hebrew congregation (or $\overline{\text{בֵּית קָהָל}}$, translated in the LXX as $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$), and that they referred to their own private gathering places in these Hebrew terms.

Paul uses the word $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ 50 times in his letters (31 times in the singular, and 19 times in the plural), but no mention is made, apart from the above mentioned private homes, of the place where the congregation gathers. Paul was interested in $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ as congregations of the true Israel, not in the places of meeting. Therefore, the omission of any reference to synagogues as places of worship, as well as his inclusion of a few references to churches in houses, do not provide a basis for answering the question of what is to be understood by $\tauὰ \acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\eta$.⁵

The problem becomes complicated when Paul first states in Gal. 1:16 the intent of his call, $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\mu\alpha\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\omicron\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, and then in 2:1-2 relates how he went up to Jerusalem fourteen years after his first meeting with Peter to put before those of repute the gospel which he had been preaching in that intervening time $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\omicron\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$. This phrase could be interpreted geographically, in which case it could have ecumenical implications in including both Jews and Gentiles. But then Paul goes on to tell the Galatians about the results of his second visit to Jerusalem. At first sight, the terms he uses now in vv. 7-9 seem to restrict $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\eta$ to its ethnic meaning, for he uses words which more sharply define both his and Peter's mission. Paul has been

entrusted with the gospel "of the uncircumcision" (τῆς ἀκροβυστίας) and Peter with that "of the circumcision" (τῆς περιτομῆς). The right hand of fellowship seems to clinch this interpretation, because there εἰς τὰ ἔθνη and εἰς τὴν περιτομήν ("to the Gentiles" and "to the circumcision", v. 9) are in juxtaposition.

It is at this point that a great deal of confusion comes into the discussion concerning the scope of Paul's missionary efforts. For often those who are using Acts as their basis for interpreting Paul's mission make this the decisive turning point in Paul's career, the moment when he left the Jews and turned solely to the Gentiles, while Peter continued his mission to those of the circumcision, i.e., Paul from then on converted pagans to Christianity, while Peter went only to the Jews.⁶ The sense in that case is definitely not geographical, but is strictly ethnic. This of course means that the two apostles, so far as their own activities were concerned, carried on a segregated mission, with the ultimate result, if they were to follow out such a principle, that they would create a non-ecumenical, segregated church. But does this conclusion, as far as it relates to Paul, fit the facts?

According to the usual chronological background of this interpretation of the ethnic division of missionary efforts, the major ministry of Paul, that in Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia, still lies in the future. Yet, as we have attempted to show in the previous chapter, when the primary material alone is used the Jerusalem conference lies not at the beginning of Paul's Macedonian ministry, but at the moment when his activity in the East is almost over, except for one tour by which he wishes to consolidate his work before going on to Rome and to Spain. In that case, though this of course was unknown to him, he has only about two years remaining of

his career from which any literature (except possibly Philippians) and any knowledge of further missionary work survives. Therefore, it is only to this primary material from this early period that one can go to discover Paul's general concept of the scope of his missionary endeavours, and to ascertain both what his intentions were after the Jerusalem conference, and what they had been for the fourteen productive missionary years prior to it. Only in this way can one discover Paul's initial ideas upon the subject, and whether he understood that the conference had restricted the ethnic scope of his work.

In the fourteen year period in which Paul spent his time mainly in Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia, there is evidence to support the view that Paul included the Jews in his mission "among the Gentiles" (ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). There is, to be sure, very little primary evidence in references to Jewish names among the resident members of Paul's churches. It is only through the use of secondary source material from Acts that, by inference, the claim can be made that any person named in the letters as Jewish is one of Paul's converts, e.g., Aristarchus, or that in other cases any person named is Jewish, e.g., Aquila, Sosthenes, or Crispus. That in itself diminishes the value of such names as an argument in the discussion. The evidence, however, in his letters which reflects his practice in the field is more abundant.

In I Cor. 9:19-23, Paul declares his principle of action. Though he states this in a letter written after the Jerusalem conference, yet, inasmuch as he uses the aorist, ἐδούλωσα, ἐγενόμην and the perfect, τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα, and since he has just returned to Ephesus from Jerusalem, it is obvious that he is referring to policies by which he conducted his work during the previous

fourteen years of his missionary labours. The passage is set within a section dealing with the Corinthians' need to respect the conscience of their fellows in matters pertaining to idol worship and eating. In this passage, in which he cites his own practice as an example, Paul shows how much he had been constantly sacrificing his own liberties for the sake of winning people to Christ, including the Jews. With this may be compared his statement in Rom. 11:14, which is to the same effect, "in order to make my fellow Jews jealous, and thus save some of them." In both instances it is his own commentary upon his lifelong practice in his Christian missionary career (cf. I Cor. 10:32-33), which, therefore, would include his work in Macedonia, Achaia, Asia, and Galatia, to the extent that there were Jews in the areas.⁷

Another passage which demonstrates the approach which Paul took in every area of his missionary campaign is in I Cor. 7:17-24, especially 17-20. Again it should be noted that this letter is written about one year before the end of his known career. Thus it is the whole fifteen previous years, the only years of his missionary labours, which are included in the assertion, "Was any one at the time of his call already circumcised? Let him not seek to remove the marks of circumcision." Of course, this could refer to proselytes, but proselytes were also, technically considered, Jews; commentators see the statement as pertaining to Jews in v. 18a as contrasted with the Gentiles referred to in v. 18b. Paul introduces this passage with the words, "Only, let everyone lead the life which the Lord has assigned to him, and in which God has called him. This is my rule in all the churches." It is obvious that Paul expects Gentiles to remain physically and ethnically Gentiles. On the other hand, he expects Jews to remain ethnically Jews and not to try to

slip over into the ranks of the Gentiles. Thus his concept of equality evidently does not mean a stereotyped, ethnic one. But his insistence upon keeping the ethnic status quo in this respect carries with it a corollary; Paul cannot missionize one group to the exclusion of another and still have an ecumenical church community (Gal. 3:26-28). Therefore the passage implies that Paul ministered not merely to Gentiles, but to Jews as well, that is, to the total community in every nation. Thus from the outset he conceives his mission to be essentially an ecumenical one; he is an apostle to the nations, which means to everyone living in those Gentile lands, including the Jews.⁸ With this should be compared I Cor. 1:22-24 (cf. 12:12-13), which shows not only the reception which he often experienced from both community groups, Jews and Gentiles, but also the fact that both groups were represented in his churches.

So when in I Cor. 9:19-20 Paul says, "I have made myself a slave to all, that I might win the more. To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews", he must have meant that inasmuch as he was already a Jew, he participated in the most significant thing that a Jew does, that is, that he took part in their community life by going to the synagogue in order to win Jews who lived in Gentile lands.⁹ Since Paul thought of the church as the new or ideal Israel (בְּרִית הַחַיִּים) and of its members as the true heirs of Abraham (cf. Gal. 3:29; Rom. 4:9-13), he certainly would not think that he was rejecting Christ if he took part in Israel's congregational worship in order to avail himself of an opportunity to win Jews to Christ, the thing that he much wanted to do (cf. I Cor. 9:20; Rom. 11:14).

Therefore, it would appear from the evidence, and on the basis of practical probabilities, that Paul frequented the synagogues, and that there he tried to win converts. It also seems that

Paul could have lived among the Jews in all of his areas of work, fraternizing with them in their homes, worshipping with them in their synagogues, abiding zealously by the law (as he well knew how to do), so that he might "win Jews" and "those under the law" (I Cor. 9:20). Thus it may be that at the beginning of his ministry in each new area, Paul initially sought out the Jews.

Just as Paul's preaching in the synagogues could be a matter of supposition so far as his letters are concerned, so too it could be with reference to the "God-fearers" whom Acts represents as part of his audience in the synagogues and as the nucleus of his churches. These also are not mentioned in the letters; on the contrary the letters give the impression that he gained his Gentile converts by approaching them in their own ground. Thus, Paul's opponents in Thessalonica did not remember him as a preacher in the synagogue, but as a sophist haranguing in the market-place, an evaluation which underlies I Thess. 1:3-2:16.¹⁰

In any case, these verses give some insight into the problem concerning the scope of Paul's ecumenism. That he went to the synagogues and to the Jews has been established as a strong probability. Now these words in I Thess. 1:3-2:16 (especially in 1:9 and 2:14) indicate that he also went directly to the pagan Gentiles, who prior to this had not become involved in Judaism.¹¹ For in the first place his remarks are not a defence against the kind of attack which could arise from methods used while teaching in the synagogues or while proclaiming his gospel among the Jews. Rabbinical discussions on points of law and scripture were a matter of common practice in Judaism, and were part of the institution of the synagogue for which the rabbi received no remuneration (cf. I Thess. 2:9). In addition, the Jews, as a class, and especially the rabbis, were

above sexual reproach even from their enemies, and such charges as these were not used against them. Thus, the charge of sophistry is not of Jewish origin arising from Paul's methods of teaching in the synagogue or because of disputation carried on with the Jews (cf. 2:3-8, 10-12). Further, Paul is contrasting his methods with those which are applicable to many pagan sophists with whom he is being compared, who used every scheme possible in their profession to earn a living, to gain advantages, or to win prestige.

The charges involve *πλάνη*, *ἀκαθαρσία*, and *δόλος* (I Thess. 2:3). a) *πλάνη* has a connotation of wilful deception, which can be interpreted as part of strategy to gain converts.¹² Paul is being charged with preaching a message which he has purposefully twisted away from truth in order more easily to get a hearing for fame or monetary gain. Paul counters the charge by making the source of his message none other than God himself (I Thess. 1:5; 2:2, 4, 13; cf. II Cor. 5:20). Therefore, it is God alone whom Paul is striving to please (I Thess. 2:4; cf. also I Cor. 1:17, 22-24; 2:1-4).

b) *ἀκαθαρσία*, uncleanness, impurity, dirt, particularly refers to immorality, especially to sexual sins.¹³ Such were rife in paganism. They were rampant in Greece (cf. 4:3-8 and the allusions of I Cor. 5:1; Acts 15:29). Some of the itinerants would employ their wives in pursuit of such ends. So the methods of evangelism used by the early Christian missionaries, which appeared to the uninitiated to be the same as those used by these unprincipled wandering teachers, laid the Christian missionaries open to the charge of the same kind of behaviour. The ease with which Paul was compared with the sophists suggests that his opponents had circumstantial evidence, based on obvious similarities from which erroneous

conclusions had been drawn, the validity of which they were not bothering to investigate, but which they were using in their persecution of the converts who joined the Christian movement from the ranks of paganism (I Thess. 2:14). Possibly some of the converts, recognizing the likenesses, were becoming uneasy before opponents, some of whom may indeed have been potential converts (cf. I Thess. 1:8a; II Cor. 10:15) who were still holding the gospel and their Christian friends at bay. So there is no reason to see other than pagan fellow Gentiles as opponents of the Christian Thessalonians. If so, then Paul is countering the effect that the opposition might have in his churches by offering them testimony of his character and his methods, which his readers themselves can vouch for (I Thess. 2:10; cf. also 1:5-7; 2:5).

c) δόλος, guile, deceit, treachery, has the sense of wicked cunning.¹⁴ Its use in conjunction with πλάνη would indicate that πλάνη deals with the validity of the message while δόλος refers to the sincerity of the missionary. The sophists who frequented the market-places were notorious for their trickery, quackery, and mercenary intentions. The practice Paul is referring to, which in II Cor. 11:12-15 and 2:17 (cf. also I Cor. 2:1-4; 3:1-2; II Cor. 4:2) he obliquely intimates is already beginning in the Christian churches, evidently infected the whole church for years to come, just as it was rife in Hellenistic paganism, both earlier and in Paul's own time (cf. Didache 11).¹⁵ I Thess. 2:5-6 is an extension in detail of the implications of this word, since Paul maintains that his preaching had been οὔτε . . . ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας . . . οὔτε ἐν προφάσει . . . οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, where κολακεία can mean either flatter, in subordination of the self to others for the purpose of gain, or fawning over another in order to

obtain self advantage.¹⁶

It is to counter these charges raised against him both in Corinth and in Thessalonica that Paul calls attention to his physical labour. He emphasizes that he and his companions earned their living by diligently pursuing their trade, working night and day at their crafts. In this way, he stresses, they were able to missionize without being a burden to anyone. Consequently, they never exploited any person for any kind of gain whatsoever (cf. I Thess. 2:9; II Thess. 3:6-8; I Cor. 9:12b-18; II Cor. 11:7-9). His methods were the very antithesis of the sophists' who plied their trade for monetary gain and selfish advantages.

The real trouble from Jewish quarters came for Paul when he presented himself "to those outside the law . . . as one outside the law", that is, when he began to reach out to pagan Gentiles for his converts, and then dared to declare them "Abraham's offspring", members of the congregation of Israel, possibly even bringing them into the synagogues, without demanding their circumcision or binding them to the observance of the Torah, indeed, categorically forbidding them to practise either (Gal. 3:1-5:12). For this reason, it may be the case that some Jewish opponents would be quick to seize this opportunity to disparage Paul's work in the eyes of other Jews and before Christian converts from pagan ranks; but they were only able to do so, because he was reaching pagans in this manner.

The great majority of such opponents would seem therefore to have been the Gentile pagans themselves. For though Paul was perfectly sincere in his motives, he nevertheless appears to have placed himself in a compromising position as far as his pagan opponents were concerned, which fact gave them ammunition for their attacks. It is because he recognized the dangers of his methods and

the use that his enemies were making of them, that he gave so much space in his letters to countering them. Thus it can be said that Paul went to the Gentiles where they were and preached to them in their own territory, using current practices to get his message across, such as speaking in market-places and possibly in the homes of God-fearers and even of interested pagans. So, from the beginning of his preaching career in northern Macedonia up to and including his activity in Corinth preceding his departure for Jerusalem and Rome, the ancient land of the sophists tried to quash Paul's work and to nullify his success by hurling the derisive epithet at him, "sophist!"

That Paul continued his policy of missionizing both Jews and Gentiles in Achaia, as he had done in Macedonia, may be inferred from such passages as I Cor. 1:22-24, which again indicates that he was associating not only with Jews, but also with the pagan Greeks away from Jewish influences, "Greeks seek wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified . . . , Christ . . . the wisdom of God", and I Cor. 9:21, "To those outside the law I became as one outside the law . . . that I might win those outside the law."

So also when Paul speaks of Greeks entering the church as Greeks (I Cor. 12:12-13), the uncircumcised as uncircumcised (I Cor. 7:18c-19; cf. Gal. 5:6; 6:12-13, 15), these people can be thought of, not as proselytes who are "of the circumcision and under the law", nor even always as God-fearers, but as pagans whom he found in pagan areas. Paul's argument in Gal. 3:6-18 also implies a Gentile audience free from synagogical influence (cf. 3:2, 5). If so, and if the mission work in Galatia came after that in Achaia (as suggested in the previous chapter), it would seem to indicate that this method of missionizing, rather than being spasmodic, was an

integral part of an intentional and customary method. It could be indicative of his primary concern for the salvation of the human race, and of a conception of the mission of the church, and so of his own mission in particular, as ecumenical from the beginning. This ecumenicity he attempted to realize in every community along the way.

Further evidence suggesting that Paul went directly to the pagan Gentiles in these lands of the ἔθνη is in I Thess. 1:9, where he says that others report, "what a welcome we had among you, and how you turned to God from idols, to serve a living and true God". God-fearers could not be termed idol-worshippers, for even if they had not fully embraced Judaism as proselytes, they certainly had already turned their backs upon polytheism and idolatry and were seeking something better. Thus by the time referred to in this passage Paul was in this community operating within the pagan Gentile habitat.

Ἐπιστρέφειν (πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἰπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων) is used here in the technical sense also found in Acts of the crossing over of people from paganism to Christianity (cf. Acts 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:20), carrying the meaning of a change of mind or course of action, especially from something else to God.¹⁷ The pagan origin of Paul's converts in Achaia is also implied in I Cor. 12:2, "You know that when you were heathen [ἔθνη], you were led astray to dumb idols". Since they had not changed ethnically, Paul is saying that now, eschatologically and religiously, they are not ἔθνη, even though formerly they had been pagans and not God-worshipping Jews, proselytes, or God-fearers (cf. II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 3:28; 6:15c). When he discusses the problem of eating meat which has been offered to idols, the background can only be pagan for the question of the

reality of an idol's existence to come up at all. Jews who had been schooled in such literature as Is. 46, even though they might believe in the existence of demonic powers, would not be troubled by it. But former pagans, with pagan friends who invited them to feasts in temples and in their homes, would (I Cor. 8:4-13). Such pagan converts would most likely have been reached by Paul within their own pagan environment, probably in the market-places, as well as in the homes of Gentile friends.

In Galatia, too, Paul made converts directly from their pagan worship and pagan milieu (cf. Gal. 4:8),¹⁸ who can hardly have been Jews or even God-fearers, but idolatrous Gentiles, and such people did not frequent synagogues in North Galatia. The only reasonable conclusion that can be reached how Paul made contact with these pagans is one to which the evidence clearly points; it was in their own territory where they congregated daily for social and business concerns.

The agreements at the Jerusalem conference do not appear to have caused Paul to make any changes in his missionary conceptions. For in letters written after the conference he continues to claim his previously worked territories as his own (II Cor. 10:13-15; cf. I Cor. 3:10 and Rom. 15:20), and also to claim all the inhabitants as prospective converts and potential members of the churches that he has already planted. No matter who might now be doing missionary work in such areas, he is only nurturing the growth that Paul has already started (I Cor. 3:4-15). The important point that Paul is making is that the results of that work must continue as a church united in Christ (v. 11). It cannot be and must not attempt to be a segregated church. He surely seems to be insisting that the church on the local level must continue to be ecumenical, just as he had

founded it. In I Cor. 7:17, for example, he uses the present middle ($\delta\iota\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$), not the aorist, for a rule that he imposes upon all his churches, even in regard to ethnic origins, which, in this context of marriage problems and social callings, seems to indicate that Paul's previous ecumenical policy continues to be an important factor in his thinking about his present and future missionary activity.

It is also in these letters that the equality of members is stressed, abolishing distinctions between racial as well as cultural groups (e.g., Rom. 10:12; II Cor. 8:13-14; Gal. 3:28; 6:15). No division of groups was contemplated by the Jerusalem agreement, as Gal. 2:11-21 and I Cor. 1:10-3:23 make clear. For in Antioch Paul's rebuke to Peter is for throwing the ecumenical church there into two distinct camps when, driven by fear, he withdrew from table fellowship with the Gentiles. Quite clearly, this had not been the intention of the agreement, at least as Paul insists on interpreting it ($\delta\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \eta\tilde{\nu}$, v. 11), nor even as Peter must have interpreted it when, before the people came from James, he quite naturally ate with the Gentiles in an integrated church gathering, and really thought there was nothing unusual about it (the point of Paul's comment in v. 14b). The natural acceptance of such local ecumenicity at this time must imply that these two leaders of the early church's missionary movement, and so also those "of repute" in Jerusalem, envisaged a church united in Christ, one that was truly ecumenical in spirit.¹⁹ That an unforeseen difficulty arose, such as that at Antioch, is quite beside the point, for it merely raised an issue that had yet to be solved within the context of that generally accepted concept of ecumenicity.²⁰

Likewise in I Corinthians it should be noted that Paul is

not objecting to Peter's or anybody's presence as such, which indicates that Paul is not thinking of Peter as a person interfering in the area, setting up Jewish churches in ethnic rivalry or opposition to those which Paul has already established, any more than he himself has tried to divide the churches in Apollos' Asian territory. How can Paul object to others coming in, if he adhered to his doctrine of oneness in Christ, especially when he is planning to leave the territories in the East for fresh ones in the West?²¹ He only objects to the clamour that the Corinthians make over Peter, or Apollos, or even over himself, or to those who set Christ up as another group leader, instead of recognizing that all Christians have their unity in Christ, who is the only foundation of the church (I Cor. 3:11; cf. 4:6). Others are welcome to build upon that foundation which has already been laid in these areas by the areas' first missionary, Paul himself, as I Cor. 3:10-15 implies. But he utterly condemns any disruption of the unity of Christians and of churches-in-Christ that he has established (I Cor. 1:13).

Therefore, it would appear that Paul adheres to his concept of the universality of his mission in Gentile lands. It is to reach everyone, Jew and Gentile, within those nations to which he is called, i.e., those nations thought of as Gentile. Likewise, Paul understands Peter's mission to those of the circumcision, as defined by the Jerusalem conference, to be just as ecumenical as his own. This applies to Paul's idea of the whole Christian mission, Hellenistic and Palestinian, whether it is ἡμεῖς (Paul and Barnabas) εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, or αὐτοὶ δὲ (Peter and the other Jerusalem apostles) εἰς τὴν περιτομήν (Gal. 2:9).²² Thus, in Paul's view, the conference only acknowledged the existing ecumenical conditions to be the work of the Holy Spirit, and so entirely outside

the authority of the Jerusalem leaders to rule upon (Gal. 2:7; cf. Acts 10:44-48; 11:17-18). The right hand of fellowship was the outward sign of an inward truth, the Spirit of God uniting those engaged in the same work under the direction of the same Spirit, which is their bond of unity in Christ (cf. I Cor. 12:13).

A tangible symbol of this unity was the offering, which undoubtedly had its roots in the concept of the solidarity of the "people of God". Yet in this connection it is important to see that the idea of the offering as a concrete way of expressing that unity did not present itself to Paul until the right circumstances suggested it. That time came only when he went to Jerusalem to confer with the apostles about the matter of unity, which was being jeopardized by the activity of apostles from outside preaching gospels contrary to his, that is, gospels of Jewish particularism. The offering itself was suggested by a common concern about a financial need. Gal. 2:10 does not say that the offering was part of a bargaining procedure;²³ rather does the passage seem to imply that it was a suggestion made because unity in Christ had been acknowledged, and the division of territorial responsibilities had been agreed upon. The acknowledgement of oneness in Christ offered the opportunity to meet a real need in the spirit of that unity. It was a simple request made, not in the sense of demand or tribute or bargaining price or begging, but of sharing in the responsibilities and blessings of their unity in Christ. The request for aid then provided Paul with the idea that the offering could be the visible instrument for the consolidation of his churches, which work would close his activity in the East. It became an effective means for him to dramatize concretely his gospel of the unity of the church that he had gone to Jerusalem to ensure. The immediate need that

presented the idea of the offering was indeed the economic situation of the Jerusalem community; but that immediate need provided the opportunity for the symbolism with which Paul filled the project. What was to be effectively symbolized was the unity not only of churches within themselves and of the missionary effort of a united church, that is, the unity of Gentile and Jewish Christians in the body of Christ, but also the compassionate response actually entailed here by that unity (cf. II Cor. 8:14).²⁴

Distinctions Abolished in Christ

The ethnically ecumenical approach which, as it has been suggested above, Paul practised throughout his ministry in the mission field was the practical application of his radically new view of the unity of the human race. This ecumenical practice he substantiates theologically in Galatians for his Gentile converts by argumentation from scripture interpreted in the light of God's act in Christ.²⁵ By this Paul claims all ethnic distinctions are abolished in Christ. In New Testament times, when a Gentile became a proselyte, he became a Jew to all intents and purposes, and was no longer a Gentile. For Paul a similar thing happens when a Gentile becomes a Christian (cf. I Cor. 12:2; II Cor. 5:17). The Gentile leaves his Gentile, pagan state and becomes, by faith, a member of the true Israel, one of "Abraham's offspring" (Gal. 3:6-9, 23-29). In fact, Paul goes the whole way in recognizing the full identity and rights of such converts with those from the ranks of blood descendants of the Patriarch, which Judaism did not do. Judaism allowed full identity except for one point. Gentiles who became proselytes could not claim Abraham as their father, and so could not claim the righteousness of Abraham. They must claim justification

only on the basis of their own merits. Paul abolishes the limitation when he proclaims believing Gentiles to have full rights as true heirs of the Patriarch (Gal. 3:29). How Paul can do this he makes clear in his argument in Galatians.

First, he relates the post-resurrection events of his own time to the events surrounding Abraham, the telos with the archē, the Eschaton (of which events in his own time were a part) with the Proton (of which Abraham was a part), for the end-time finds its meaning in terms of the beginning-time. Thus Paul demands that his readers take the Abrahamic perspective of history, and then from that point of view he interprets the conversion of pagans in his present time as a sign of the fulfilment of the promise that God had made to Abraham in the beginning times. Paul is interpreting post eventum. So he alters traditional interpretations to fit new conditions.²⁶ For Paul, who had experienced the resurrection and the Gentile Christian mission, there were new facts to be considered. The Christ had come; pagans were becoming Christian; Gentile Christians were filled with the Holy Spirit without either pledging allegiance to the Torah or undergoing the rite of circumcision (Gal. 3:5). The old Jewish views did not fit these facts. New and altered conditions demanded fresh understanding of ancient words. The stumbling block for the Jews was Christ crucified (cf. Gal. 3:1; 5:11b). The stumbling block for Judaizers, whether Gentile or Jewish Christians, was the election of pagans without law or circumcision. Paul puts his finger on the trouble by going back to the origin of the traditional concept. He returns to the promise made to Abraham and re-examines that event in the light of what had happened and was now happening. He shows it is at this point that both Jews and Judaizing Christians make their mistake, for they

interpret the story as promises made to Abraham as the father of Israel after the flesh. Paul, on the other hand, perceives that the promise was made to Abraham as father of Israel according to faith (Gal. 3:7, 9). Of course, in Hebrew thought Abraham is the father of Israel. But Paul uses this vantage point of Abraham, to whom the promise was made, to draw a previously unrecognized distinction between the two Israels, and to indicate which was which by showing where the dividing line between the old Israel and the true Israel lay.

By this involved, allegorical reinterpretation of old facts, Paul explains the enigma of the new facts. For of the two children born to Abraham, one was by the slave woman (contemporary Jerusalem), who, allegorically, was the mother of unbelieving, Torah-enslaved Judaism; whereas the true Israel, the believing church, was the child of the free woman (the Jerusalem that is above, see Gal. 4:22-28). The free woman's son, Isaac (i.e., by the logic of his argument, Christians-in-Christ--4:26, 28, 31), was the child of the promise (vv. 28-31).²⁷ Thus the promise belongs to those who are in Christ (3:26-27, 29). Consequently, previous nationality makes no difference. Jews as well as Gentiles are heirs of the promise only if they believe, and not by any genetic bond. Therefore, when God made the promise to Abraham, saying "In you shall all the nations be blessed" (Ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Gal. 3:8), the term ἔθνη does not connote, as Schridt claims, all nations except Israel. For, as he intimates, Paul was naturally aware that Israel was blessed by virtue of descent by blood from Abraham, which, as has been shown, is beside the point in Paul's argument in Gal. 3-4. It connotes rather all nations including Israel.²⁸ In this context, therefore, ἔθνη is an ecumenical term

of Universal scope with no exceptions. Jews as well as Gentiles have to cross over to this new category (cf. 3:10-14, 22, 27-29).

Paul then reiterates the argument in 3:15-19, where the promise is said not to be made to the Jews by racial descent, but rather "till the offspring should come to whom the promise had been made" (3:19b, cf. 3:14). So that no one would misunderstand him, Paul further strengthens his argument by showing that the law did not come to Judaism for another 430 years. Thus he removes whatever ground the Jews presumed that they had for claiming any right to the inheritance on the basis of their possession of the law (cf. 3:11). To be sure, the law had its rightful place in God's plan, but only to make sure that everything except faith was consigned to sin (3:21-22a), so that faith should be the only way to the inheritance.²⁹

Second, Paul declares that the anticipated time has come (3:25-26; cf. II Cor. 5:17b). It is something beyond the old; it is a new creation (II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; cf. 5:6). It has not come in visible fullness into the world (Rom. 8:24-25), which fullness would be identical with the Kingdom of God itself, for all creation still groans for the Parousia, when it shall be perfected (cf. Rom. 8:19-23). Nevertheless, the eschatological age has come in the sense that now one can participate in it through faith by being incorporated into Christ (cf. Rom. 8:23; Gal. 3:26-27). It is on this level of existence, an anticipated fact realized in existence through union by faith with Christ (Gal. 3:26-29), that distinctions between Jew and Greek fade away (3:28).³⁰

Nowhere, however, does Paul say that a Gentile Christian becomes an Israelitic Jew without the rite of circumcision. Rather, he forbids Gentiles to practise the rite of circumcision in an

attempt to become ethnic Jews along with becoming Christian (cf. I Cor. 7:18), for in so doing, he insists, they will be going backward, instead of forward, in God's teleological plan which is unfolding in history (Gal. 3:3 [1-14]; 4:8-10; 5:4 [1-12]), and Paul's work would be in vain (4:11).³¹ Thus, Paul is presenting a new idea, and he is setting it out as an established fact. Eschatologically speaking, both Jew and Gentile have now become a new creation in Christ (Gal. 3:27; II Cor. 5:17), a people in whom ethnic divisions are eschatologically abolished. It is this new Israel, the ideal, eschatological Israel longed for by the fathers of the past, that is now already essentially present in the church, where "there is neither Jew nor Greek" (Gal. 3:28), for no longer do such distinctions count for anything (Gal. 5:6; 6:15).

Third, the period between Abraham and those "in Christ" is an age of preparation or waiting; but for those who are "in Christ" it is a past age in relation to the new age that has come (cf. Gal. 3:19; also Col. 1:13-14). Being a Jew under the law (Gal. 3:23-26; 4:1-5) or a Gentile subject to elemental things (Gal. 4:8-9) are things of the past aeon.³² Thus Paul is saying that according to God's plan of self-revelation for the sake of world salvation, the two relevant earlier periods of history have already been superseded by the third, the age of Christ, in which the ultimate has already become effective in creation and history (cf. Gal. 6:15). The first was that of Abraham and of the promise to Abraham. It was pre-Israelitic. The second was the age of the law and of Judaism on the one hand, and of the Gentiles in bondage to beings not gods on the other. It was a time of waiting and restraint. Now is the third age, the age of Christ. It is a new creation. In this new creation all are already one in Christ by faith. In this age there

is no distinction.

It may be that this conviction of Paul that there is no distinction in Christ, which he practised from the commencement of his mission to the Gentiles, and which he argued theologically in Galatians, may already have been for him a truth verified in experience in his first missionary activity, and may account for the way in which he wrote in I Thessalonians. For if the Thessalonian congregation was as loyal to Paul as he claims it to have been (I Thess. 3:6-10), why was any defence of his character, of his methods, and of his gospel necessary at all? Most answer this question by suggesting that possibly Timothy reported that opposition from outside, especially stirred up by Jews, was attempting to discredit Paul in the eyes of his converts, and that this was, or soon would be, affecting the present situation in the Thessalonian church. So Paul wrote a defence of his actions in order to avert such a catastrophe.

This may be partly true, but it is not entirely satisfactory, inasmuch as the loyalty of the congregation appears to be beyond doubt and the letter abounds in thanksgiving and praise for this spirit of its members. The answer must take this background into consideration.

Martin Dibelius³³ thinks that in 2:1-13 Paul is merely using stock phrases, such as those that he used when he was in Thessalonica, but is now using them without any special occasion in mind. Phrases like these, Dibelius says, were used by both Christian missionaries and sincere pagan itinerant teachers in order to separate themselves in the public's mind from the host of notorious leeches wandering about teaching quack philosophical and religious ideas. This solution is still, however, partially unsatisfactory,

for it makes Paul's letter too irrelevant to any local situation, which in itself does not fit the usual character of Paul's letters. Again, why should Paul use generalities against this background of praise for the loyalty of his converts?

Even though each mission in each area was begun by Paul and was nurtured by his helpers, as well as by others who came in later from the outside (cf. I Cor. 3:5-15), passages such as I Thess. 1:3, 8 and II Cor. 10:15-16 indicate that his method of evangelism depended largely upon the enthusiasm and personal witness of the individual Christians, whose faith and labours caused the church to cohere and to increase rapidly. The whole introductory paragraph (I Thess. 1:2-10) is a thanksgiving by Paul for the effort, faith, love, and loyalty exhibited on the part of the Macedonians who continued his work by their example. This in itself may indicate one of the primary reasons why Paul wrote the letter, namely, to encourage and to guide this church in its active witnessing which was having such marked success.

On the one hand, however, this very success fomented problems. The Jews and the native population may have endeavoured to undermine this activity by subtly questioning the validity of the Gentile Thessalonians' election, and did so by alluding to the practices and teachings of Paul and his fellow missionaries as suspect. Paul's Christian readers needed to know answers to basic questions. How could they be sure that they were of the elect? How could Paul be sure that his gospel was true?

Yet on the other hand, this remarkably rapid increase of the faith (1:7-8) gave Paul the tangible evidence that he needed to prove to his Macedonian converts why he knew that his gospel was the true gospel, why his methods were the right methods for him to use as he

pursued his mission to the Gentiles (and which, therefore, they were to use), and why he knew (the emphasis upon εἰδότες) that God elected them. In spite of his own zeal and faith in his mission, the fear might have been lurking in Paul's mind ever since he left Macedonia that opponents outside the church might be insinuating the opposite (cf., e.g., 2:1-2, 13, 14; 3:1-5), thus endangering or weakening the faith and witness of the Thessalonians. This is plausible, because the phrasing used by Paul in 1:4-10 suggests it, viz., εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν, ὅτι . . . ("For we know, brethren beloved by God, that he has chosen you; for . . ."). The ὅτι (v. 5) is a conjunction of inference meaning "because" or "since", and introduces two reasons why Paul "knows" (εἰδότες) that the Thessalonians are elected by God. The first reason, v. 5, is Paul's own sense of power derived from the Holy Spirit; the second reason, which confirms the first, is the way the Thessalonians have responded to Paul's work, not only by becoming Christians, but by emulating him ever since (vv. 6-10; cf. 2:13).³⁴ Thus, the phrase "God has chosen you" is not so much a theological reflection on the idea of election, as Paul's testimony to the Thessalonians of the visible and powerful signs that the Holy Spirit was working through him, through his co-workers, and also so dramatically through the converts themselves (cf. Gal. 2:7-9; Acts 15:6-19). These were his own first experienced proofs of the validity of the eschatological truth lying behind his call to preach to the Gentiles revealed to him at his conversion (cf. II Cor. 3:2-6).

The Macedonians had been convinced, when Paul was there, not only by the message itself, but by the integrity of the lives of Paul and his workers (1:5b), i.e., they had noted the contrast

between the missionaries' lives and those of the quacks. Now the Thessalonians themselves, with the help of the Holy Spirit, were likewise witnessing by their own example (cf. 4:9-10), influencing the expansion of the church throughout Macedonia and even in Achaia (cf. 1:6-10). Paul was so enthused by this turn of events that he wished that he could return to supply anything lacking in their faith which might help them in their labours (3:10; this is perhaps referred to in chs. 4-5 and II Thessalonians).³⁵ Thus the letter is not a window into an inner wrestling by Paul with questions of doubt concerning the ecumenism of his gospel and the validity of his mission, but is an affirmation of faith in these principles, with which he first set out upon his mission ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, as true and as abundantly verified by his experiences with the Thessalonians. This experience he uses to guide them and to bolster their faith as they continue their witnessing.

The next question is, how far did Paul endeavour to implement these convictions, which he defended theologically in Galatians and which were verified in experience in Thessalonica, in the social structures of the local church? Did this concept of a universal gospel have relevance for Paul in concrete human relationships other than the ethnic divisions of mankind? How universally relevant was Paul's gospel of "no distinction"? And how far was he prepared to go to implement its implications in world society?

In I Cor. 12:28-30 Paul names several services rendered in congregations by their members according to natural ability and calling. Each calling is considered important, and though one may draw attention to itself more than others do, and so becomes a cause for envy and animosity, yet each comes from the same Spirit and the same Lord. Therefore, inasmuch as each serves the same body, there

cannot by any question about status; they are all "for the common good" (12:7). Paul's idea differs radically from the usual concepts of gradations of status, for "God has so composed the body, giving the greater honour to the inferior part, that there may be no discord in the body, but that the members may have the same care for one another" (vv. 24-25). This concept of complete equality and oneness could be called a typically Hebraic ideal, now being actualized in the statusless fellowship of the church (cf. Rom. 8:29). For according to Paul, each person in the Christian community outdoes the other in giving honour (Rom. 12:10). What happens to one, happens to all (I Cor. 12:26).

As can be seen, however, by the list of talents that he presents in I Cor. 12:28, Paul is not equating equality with uniformity.³⁶ At first glance he may seem to cancel out his concept of a statusless society by arranging the functions performed by members of the churches in an order of declining relative importance, but in this context, where it introduces the considerations of chs. 13-14, it is otherwise. Any person may possess several abilities (I Cor. 12:31; 14:1, 12, 39). Though Paul desires everyone to be able to speak with tongues (the gift that was giving status), he also wants everyone to be able to interpret his ecstatic experience to others, i.e., to be able to prophesy (I Cor. 14:1, 5, 13). Yet the person who possesses the latter gift he places second to the apostles. Thus it is a society in which all are conceived, at least potentially, as being on the same level before God, who grants the gifts through his Spirit (I Cor. 12:11). So before God there is no status; all are equals.³⁷

None of the gifts that Paul discusses in I Cor. 12, however, can compare with the supreme gifts of faith, hope, and love.

Hering³⁸ regards ch. 13 as an interruption between ch. 12 and ch. 14; but Robertson and Plummer³⁹ and Craig⁴⁰ see it as an integral part of the whole. In 14:1 the principle of love, exalted in ch. 13, is linked to the desire for the gifts of the Spirit, so that status with respect to them is abolished (cf. I Cor. 12:11). Whatever one does, therefore, one does for the sake of love which manifests itself in whatever gift the Spirit has given to one for "building up the church" (14:12). The functions catalogued by Paul are those necessary for the growth, edification, harmony, and enrichment of the body of Christ, a body of love and concern, of which all Christian communities and all Christians are now a part (12:25-27; 14:5, 12; cf. Rom. 12).⁴¹

The implication of this is that Paul went to all classes of people with his gospel and then strove to remove all traces of status from the community resulting. Class, like nationality or race, provides no barrier to his message, which message aims at an eradication from the community-in-Christ of those things which in the world create class distinctions and consequent status. "Neither slave nor free" becomes transparent in meaning when seen in an actual situation encountered by Paul in the case of Onesimus and Philemon. There slavery is abolished in love and devotion, a state of existence that is demonstrable in Christian brotherhood, for $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu \dots \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\varsigma$ (Phlm. 15) has the meaning of a receiving in full forever, i.e., something not absolved even by death (cf. also I Cor. 7:22). The Parousia, the ultimate goal of creation and history, itself conforms to this equality within a statusless community permeated by love, when even Christ steps down from his Lordship and enters the Kingdom of God subject like everyone else to "him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to

everyone" (I Cor. 15:28), when Christ becomes "the first-born among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29-30; cf. I Cor. 15:23).

Nevertheless, these eschatological conditions have been realized only in the realm of Christ; they are not yet the final perfection which will be actualized in the Kingdom of God. It would also seem that Paul realistically recognizes the continued existence of outward worldly states for those who are in the "body of Christ"; the present age of Christ's Kingdom runs concurrently with the kingdom of this world, so that there is an overlapping of the two ages. This would seem to be the basis for his counsel to the Corinthians when he tells them that they should remain in whatever state they originally were in (I Cor. 7:17-24).⁴² That is not, however, fundamental for those who are in the present condition of "being in Christ", and who discover that those previous conditions count for nothing before God (Gal. 3:26-29), and are likewise to count for nothing before Christians themselves. Col. 3:11 uses Gal. 3:28 and adds a further phrase, "barbarian, Scythian". Inasmuch as Paul in his argument in the rest of Gal. 3 used ἔθνη as a universally inclusive word, he is forced in 3:28, in order to distinguish between Jews and non-Jews, to use another nearly synonymous term for the non-Jews, which is Ἕλληνας.⁴³ If Paul should not be the author of this particular passage in Colossians, then the editor who inserted it here shows his appreciation of Paul's ecumenism when he spells out the significance of Paul's more limited phraseology in this particular verse (Gal. 3:28) to make it cover the universal range which he knows Paul intended, i.e., that it includes not only Ἕλληνας (Hellenes), but those who were ordinarily distinguished from them--the uncouth barbarians, and the Scythians on the borders of the civilized world.

Not even sex, in Paul's view, provides any basis for status in the community of Christ. Instead, there is a recognition of the full equality of the sexes--"there is neither male nor female" (Gal. 3:28).

Despite the evident conflict in his own thinking on the question of marital relations, Paul is nevertheless sure that there is essentially no barrier of inequality existing between the sexes in the community of Christ. It should be noted that the counsel which he gives to those in either the marriage or celibate states, he gives equally to both sexes without making any distinction of status between them (I Cor. 7, passim). His own social attitude towards women bears this out, and throws light upon his words (cf. Rom. 16:1-2, 3-4, 6, 15; I Cor. 1:11; Phil. 4:2-3). In synagogues men and women were evidently segregated. The synagogue at Khirbet Shema',⁴⁴ dated circa fourth century A.D. (though undoubtedly in continuation of an ancient practice), has a stairway to a women's gallery, and a doorway to the main floor to which the men descended. This may explain the presence of I Cor. 14:34, which probably is not Pauline, but was added by a later editor who was used to synagogue practices. For according to I Cor. 11:5, Paul allows women to pray and to prophesy in worship and in public assemblies. Thus 11:5 reveals a break with the restrictive synagogue practices. If, however, I Cor. 14:34 should be by Paul, then, since it is closely connected with the section on glossalia and prophesying, it could represent practical advice given by Paul in exasperation over the unruly condition existing in the Corinthian church which was causing scandal in the pagan community and discord in the fellowship. In that case, since it is not in harmony with his principles enunciated elsewhere, it cannot be assumed to be a principle of conduct here.

In fact, this passage reveals that women were far from being segregated or silenced in Paul's churches, and if it was added by a later editor, making an application to churches generally, then in the same indirect way it speaks for the equality of women that was actually being practised in Christian communities in his times, although a practice which he himself may have been prejudiced against.⁴⁵ Thus the ecumenical significance of the words, "neither male nor female" becomes clear, and is found to be consistent with Paul's general ecumenical idea of the mission of the church, and especially with his evangelistic methods.

On the relationship of one person to another in the social structure of the world, Paul may possibly be admitting the social structuring of the existing world into the Christians' wider social relationships with that world, thus such household rules as in Col. 3:18-4:1. Lohse⁴⁶ has amassed a valuable array of materials and discussion on this section. These codes for Paul are practicable for social action in terms of love in given situations while at the same time the Christians remain zealously "obedient to the Kyrios".⁴⁷ But of course when one is obedient to the Kyrios as contained in Paul's gospel, a social antithesis productive of change in any age is inevitable. Paul by no means attempts to contain the antithesis between the gospel and society in an equilibrium satisfactory to the status quo,⁴⁸ or to the dominance of the male,⁴⁹ or to the status structures of society as "ordained" by God and gratefully accepted by the privileged few. Such would hardly be a satisfactory explanation of Paul's practical daily code of ethics, even if codified and inserted into Colossians by his school, or indeed Paul would have suffered for his cause in vain and his gospel, as it bears on such social relationships, would in practice become but

insipid platitudes. And this it hardly seems to be when judged by the principles so far examined in this study. Rather, a different incentive controls the interrelationship of those in the church, not repressive authority (except God's creative authority in Christ to which Christians are obedient) but love. Love controls (II Cor. 5:14), directs, transforms. The new society is a new creation (II Cor. 5:17). The worldly structures noted above are not part of it, but are of the old creation which still exists. And only because Christians still live within the old do these continue to exert authority over him, and only for that reason does Paul realistically recognize their temporal significance.

It is clear, therefore, that Paul's ecumenism cannot be limited in its definition merely to a drive to reach the ends of the inhabited world with the gospel so that all nations may be included in the church. It must itself be conceived as socially all-embracing and unifying as well. Paul visualized his own mission and that of the church as truly universal in scope and form, a world mission in which all humanity are united as one body in Christ, with all worldly distinctions of status creatively abolished in love.

CHAPTER IV

ECUMENICAL PRINCIPLES IN PRACTICE

In the previous chapter it was argued that when Paul went on his mission to evangelize amongst the Gentiles, he conceived that mission of the church to be both racially and socially ecumenical. His conception suggests a qualitative ecumenism which demands not merely that by a given time the bounds of the inhabited world (*οἰκουμένη*) must be reached with the proclamation of the gospel, but that in the meantime the unification of the world in the community of Christ, in which distinctions of race, class, and sex are abolished, must also be proclaimed and be set in motion. The missionary programme of the church, which involves announcing and initiating this, is part of the work which Christ, who now reigns, and whose reign is reflected in the expansion of the church, carries on until he has conquered his last enemy, death, at which time God's Kingdom begins.

Evidence from Paul's letters shows that he and his helpers spent considerable time and effort in the field consolidating the churches, and in striving for these conditions in the Christian community. An examination of Paul's method of organizing his field operations should indicate the seriousness with which he viewed these ecumenical principles as part of the ministry of the church, and how well his own methods reflected them, as well as how they were related to his intention to cover the whole *οἰκουμένη* in his mission.

Paul Keeps Contact with His Churches

There is sufficient evidence that Paul intended from the beginning of his ministry to preserve close contact with his churches as part of his continuing missionary programme. The existence of some of his letters indicates that he did so, and that he used letter writing as one way of instructing on specific issues (cf. II Thess. 2:15; I Cor. 4:14; that he wrote other letters no longer extant appears from I Cor. 5:9; Col. 4:16; cf. also II Thess. 2:15; 3:17). Kümmel dates all Paul's extant letters from the "peak and termination" of his career.¹ According to the chronology followed here, however, his letters commence near the beginning of his career. He did not, indeed, limit himself to writing letters to maintain these contacts; nevertheless the assumption that he himself found time for distant pastoral visitations or that he was constantly on the move, as Acts seems to imply,² needs to be critically examined by studying his letters in their proper order for evidence when, where, why, and even that such took place, and for evidence that will show to what extent such interfered with his daily labour or vice versa. For it is necessary to bear in mind that Paul clearly depended upon his own toil for a living.

Not long after Paul had finished his initial campaign in Macedonia, he wrote his first letter to the Thessalonians. In this letter he commented on the anguish which he had felt for them while he was being hindered by Satan at Athens (I Thess. 2:17-18). The ties between Paul and his congregations were strong (I Thess. 3:6), but conditions prevented him from seeing them then, though he and his helpers looked forward to a time when they could visit them in person to continue work amongst them (I Thess. 3:10). This demonstrates that from the inception of his mission he had a planned

programme of co-ordinating and developing the churches in his expanding mission field.

The evidence of the epistles appears to be that he made few if any journeys back to his established churches once he had left their province. Circumstances beyond Paul's knowledge and control, such as his experience in Athens (cf. II Cor. 11:23-28), could easily have prevented him from making, as part of his regular missionizing programme, visitations to provinces where he had previously missionized. Furthermore, there is no evidence in Paul's letters that he travelled for any reason away from either Macedonia or Achaia until he had finished his initial missionizing in each respective province. Missionizing his current area and working for a living likewise may have prevented him making visitations himself to other, more distant regions outside the province in which he was then working.

This does not mean, however, that the essence of his initial plan was not kept or even improved upon, for as new and unpredictable situations arose, he may have adjusted his original organizational procedures accordingly. The next time that Paul is encountered in his own letters he is a resident of Ephesus (cf. I Cor. 16:8, 19), and there is no evidence that in the meantime he had been back to Macedonia (cf. Phil. 4:15). But whichever route he took to go from Corinth to Ephesus (cf. Acts 18:18-19a), it seems clear from his denial in Galatians that he went up to Jerusalem between his first visit there to Peter and his second visit there fourteen years later, that he did not go at this time to Jerusalem, but remained in Ephesus where he established his headquarters for his missionary programme.³

Evidence that Paul travelled to areas relatively remote from

Ephesus during his residence in Asia prior to his second journey to Jerusalem is lacking in letters which come from that period (the second visit to Corinth was after the Jerusalem conference, cf. II Cor. 13:1). In fact, Colossians points in the opposite direction, "I want you to know how greatly I strive for you, and for those at Laodicea, and for all who have not seen my face" (Col. 2:1). There could be, however, a possible exception in Philemon where Paul writes, "At the same time, prepare a guest room for me, for I am hoping through your prayers to be granted to you" (v. 22); for if one connects this sentence and several similar ones, e.g., "So if you consider me your partner" (v. 17), and "For I have derived much joy and comfort from your love" (v. 7), with "to say nothing of your owing me even your own self" (v. 19b), then one has a case for saying that there could have been some sort of prior meeting between these two men, perhaps in Colossae, which resulted in Philemon's conversion by Paul.

Yet a visit to Philemon's home in Colossae (cf. v. 2 and Col. 4:9, 17) would not have been necessary in order to establish this relationship. As the above suggests, and as the whole tone of the letter implies, Paul had met and had been on intimate terms with Philemon before this. But Paul could have witnessed to Philemon while doing business with him in Ephesus, as he could also have done business there with the slave, Onesimus, and with other members of the family mentioned in the letter. For Philemon seems to be well-to-do, and so may have been in a situation where he needed Paul's products or services and came to Ephesus for them. In addition, if the church in Colossae had been the same as "the church in your house" referred to in Philm. 2, since "Archippus our fellow soldier" is a member of Philemon's household (v. 2) and is also connected

with the church in Colossae (Col. 4:17), or even if the church in Philemon's house was a church separate from the church in Colossae, then it would indeed be strange if Paul had visited Philemon's house often enough to have been well established in his friendship and had still not seen the Colossians by face (Col. 2:1). Therefore, there is also a case for saying that up to this time, Paul had not visited either Colossae or Laodicea from Ephesus, and that his relationship with Philemon was probably established in Ephesus.

If the letter to Philemon was written near the time that Paul went to Jerusalem to meet privately with the apostles, then he could have been making plans during this imprisonment for such a journey. In that case, he could have hoped to see Philemon en route to or from Jerusalem; hence his request. Onesimus' need for a letter from Paul to his master provided the opportunity. If this should be so, then this instance is the only reference to any intended visit by Paul to any city of considerable distance from his Ephesian residence preceding his second visit to Jerusalem. If this journey did take place at the time suggested above, then it should be noted that it came only at an important juncture in Paul's missionary campaign, and did not interrupt his normal practice which he seems to have followed throughout his residence in Asia.

There is, however, one important exception to this, that is, Paul's first visit to North Galatia; but as previously observed, that was plausibly the result of some affliction which drove him far away to recuperate. Such a rest cure would be one that any friendly partner or employer would readily grant and insist upon. If Prisca and Aquila happened to be those employers, then who more so than they? Even if Paul was self-employed, then these people, as Christian friends, might insist on his going and even help him to

finance it and help him on his way (cf. Rom. 16:3-4). At any rate, under such or similar conditions, Paul's journey could hardly be considered a planned tour or visitation which had as its express purpose the carrying on of missionary activity, though that he did so while there is certain (cf. Gal. 1:6; 3:1; 4:12b-16).

Finally, about fourteen years after Paul had commenced his work in Macedonia (cf. Gal. 2:1), he went to Jerusalem. The occasion which brought him into prison in Asia, where he wrote to Philemon and to the Colossians, may have been the climax of a series of difficulties which had occurred in his missionary career ever since he first arrived in Philippi (cf. II Cor. 6:4-10; 10-11; I Thess. 2:2, 18; 3:3-4), so that for some reason he now felt compelled to go to Jerusalem "lest somehow I should be running or had run in vain" (Gal. 2:2). Thus there is little if any evidence that Paul himself made visitations to churches at a distance, or that he considered such to be an essential part of his missionary programme.

Paul's Use of Associates

If Paul did not limit himself to writing letters in order to maintain contact between himself and his churches, and did not himself make visitations, and yet strove to consolidate the churches in his vast area and to secure the right conditions within them, then attention is directed to his possible use of co-workers for that purpose. He could not possibly evangelize one province after another, keep in contact with all points of his extensive mission field, at the same time work hard for a living, and do it alone.

Who Paul's co-workers were and what their relationship was to him, and whether his ecumenical principles were reflected in his own field practices can only be ascertained by an examination of the

evidence as it appears in his letters when these are studied in chronological sequence. Only then can any possible change in, or development of, his missionary methods and organizational concepts be evaluated. Therefore, the method that will be followed in this section will be to examine each letter in turn in chronological order to find out who Paul's helpers were, what their functions were relative to the historical situation of the letter, and what in relation to these functions was the significance of the terms that he used for them. Ellis⁴ has made a comparative terminological study of Paul's co-workers, which will be referred to as the respective terms are met in their own situation; but he makes no attempt to relate Paul's use of terms to historical circumstances, or to functions being performed by individuals in relation to these circumstances.

In his first extant letter, I Thessalonians, Paul writes, "Therefore when we could bear it no longer, we were willing to be left behind at Athens alone" (3:1). The first person plural in this letter presumably refers back to 1:1a, "Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy", or to any combination of Paul (the writer) and the other of the three.⁵ In this situation, Timothy is performing missionary work in Thessalonica. He is Paul's and Silvanus' representative, doing work which they also would do if they had been able to be present (cf. I Thess. 3:2-3).⁶

Timothy finally returned to Paul and Silvanus--and as an associate in the field who reported to his colleagues about the situation in Macedonia (3:6). It is not stated who bore I and II Thessalonians to the recipients. Timothy is one upon whom Paul could depend as he would a son to carry out his wishes (cf. Phil. 2:20, 22). It is therefore possible that Timothy continued to be

the evangelist co-worker who was especially concerned with Macedonia (cf. Phil. 2:19-22; also I Cor. 4:17; 16:10-11) while Silvanus aided Paul in missionizing Achaia, although it should be noted that Timothy helped there as well (cf. II Cor. 1:19). It is not contrary to Paul's procedure to send workers back to previously missionized territories. There could have been several unrecorded visits (cf. Acts 18:5). So some, if not a great deal, of Paul's teaching "everywhere in every church" (I Cor. 4:17) is the teaching that he did through such men as Timothy, inasmuch as he says, "he is doing the work of the Lord, as I am" (I Cor. 16:10).⁷

In the address of his letter to the Colossians written while he is a resident in Ephesus, Paul includes the name of Timothy. But he does not state what Timothy's relationship is to these Asian churches. Tychicus is described by Paul as a σύνδουλος ἐν Κυρίῳ "fellow servant in the Lord" (4:7; cf. Epaphras, a "fellow servant", 1:7; cf. 4:12).⁸ Onesimus and Tychicus are both termed "beloved brothers".⁹ One of their functions on this visit is to inform the Colossians about Paul and his companions, and about the affair that led to their affliction (4:9). Yet it would seem that Tychicus, who is a δῆκονος, does much more than bear news to these congregations. The context implies that Tychicus ministers in their area.¹⁰

The letters which compose the canonical I Corinthians were written towards the conclusion of Paul's ministry in the East, after his return from his second visit to Jerusalem. Sosthenes, also called "the brother", is included in the address. In I Cor. 1:11 Paul says that Chloe's people have brought him news about quarrels in the Corinthian church. Then in I Cor. 16:17 he says that Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus have come from Corinth. These three Corinthians are each included by Paul as τῶ συνεργούντι

(fellow worker) καὶ κοπιῶντι (labourer), and so he identifies them with the work that is being done in their community.¹¹

In Galatians, however, Paul does not mention any particular individual as being a co-labourer directly connected with the Galatian churches. If, as has been suggested above, Paul went to Galatia the first time, not with the intention to evangelize, but rather to recuperate, then his regular associates may have remained behind to continue to missionize in the established mission fields and to continue labouring for their livelihood in their place of residence (cf. I Thess. 2:9; II Thess. 3:8; II Cor. 11:9). Though he makes no mention of the ones who brought the news to him, and who probably carried his letter back with them, it is nevertheless evident that he depends upon this letter to right matters and to renew the Galatians' loyalty solely to him, since he does not promise them any further visit, either by any of his co-workers or by himself; "Henceforth let no man trouble me" (6:17a). In that case, Paul's second visit to Galatia, like his visit to Macedonia and Corinth later, was intended to consummate his own direct part in the work in the area. So he adds one final and decisive remark which he relied upon for this climax to bring them back to their senses. "I bear on my body the marks of Jesus" (6:17b). This reference to marks on his person fits in well with the reason that has been suggested earlier for his going to Galatia. How could they forget the sight that he had presented to their eyes when he arrived there that first time just a few years before? "I bear on my body the marks of Jesus" does not refer to the stigmata in the ecclesiastical sense, but perhaps to the fact that just before the crucifixion, Jesus was scourged (Mt. 27:26; Mk. 15:15; Jn. 19:1; also cf. Mk. 10:34; Lk. 18:33).¹² Paul certainly could not forget, for he

himself shared the horror, and that the Galatians knew. With a stroke of the pen he recalled it shockingly to their mind. Then he abruptly signed off, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen." Did his renewed witness serve its purpose and reclaim his congregation? They at any rate preserved his letter for posterity.

In the corpus of letters in II Corinthians, Timothy is again mentioned in the address (1:1), but to which fragmentary letter contained in the collection this originally served as the address is not known. Undoubtedly, each communication initially contained a similar opening.¹³ In what is possibly the third in the sequence of letters which make up this compilation, the Corinthians are reminded that the first group of missionaries who came and converted them was composed of Paul, Timothy, and Silvanus (II Cor. 1:19). This is exactly the same group as that which appears in the addresses in the letters to the Thessalonians.

The section which according to Marxsen makes up the first letter in the corpus of II Corinthians, i.e., II Cor. 2:14-7:4,¹⁴ contains no reference to specific workers. But the third section, the "severe letter" (10-13), states that Paul had sent Titus and a brother to the Corinthians (12:18).¹⁵ Though this study is concerned with Paul's ecumenism and is not primarily an attempt to disentangle the possible letters, or the events in those which compose the canonical epistles I and II Corinthians, yet the chronology and field organization that are being suggested here may (1) offer a plausible solution to the riddle of the sequence of events that is alluded to in I and II Corinthians, and (2) throw some light upon Paul's use of his fellow workers.

The first question to be asked is, what is the sequence of

events reflected in I and II Corinthians and how did they come about? It is suggested here that fresh from Jerusalem and enthusiastic over the results of the conference and especially over the mutual pledge of evangelism, Paul immediately sent Titus and the brother to Corinth to begin the work of consolidation there (cf. II Cor. 12:18);¹⁶ an important activity connected with this would seem to be collecting the offering for Jerusalem (cf. II Cor. 8:6).¹⁷

In what order messengers or visitors came to Paul from Corinth and with what news can only be conjectured from inferences in the letters which allude to the historical situation. Starting from the information that Paul sent a previous letter (cf. I Cor. 5:9-11) and from the divisional structure of I Cor. 5-16, each section of which begins with a restatement of a question or problem contained in a letter the Corinthians had sent to him (cf. 5:1; 7:1, 25; 8:1; 9:1-3; 12:1; 15:1; 16:1), some have tried to recompose that letter of the Corinthians as well as to push their conjectures farther back to the letter from Paul which they presume first instigated the queries.¹⁸

Every question asked by the Corinthians, however, was not necessarily provoked by something Paul had written in his previous letter--which is the assumption of Hurd and others who try to recompose it. Paul himself intimates what his previous letter contained (chs. 5-6). He does not reiterate any such intimation (cf. 5:9, 11) before any of the other introductions to his answers to their questions. In fact, in 7:1 he drops his references to his former letter and turns wholly to theirs, as though all questions pertaining to his own letter had been completely dealt with. Therefore one cannot assume that he had instructed them on any of those other questions which they raise, and from that then go on to

reconstruct a teaching by Paul contained in that letter which is wholly out of character and which later he has to amend, retract, or refute almost in entirety.¹⁹

It is suggested here that when Paul arrived back in Ephesus from Jerusalem he found Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus already there.²⁰ Paul makes no mention that they in any way had come to Ephesus on church business. Nevertheless, he rejoices in their fellowship. They made up for the fact that even though Paul could not receive visits from all the Corinthians, at least the visitors represented them and refreshed him (I Cor. 16:17-18).

Thus the tone of this paragraph is friendly, even joyful. This is hardly the prevailing tone of the rest of I Corinthians, written later. The real trouble had not yet broken. The news that these visitors conveyed to Paul was, to be sure, not all good. What in particular was not good is indicated only by his references in chs. 5-6 to his instructions on the moral problem upon which he had focused his attention in the previous letter. Those lost admonishments of the previous letter and the extant greetings in 16:15-18 may indeed be the only items in that letter. The previous letter was undoubtedly taken to Corinth by Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus when they returned. Titus and the brother could have gone to Corinth with them.²¹ This would have been in the autumn when travel by sea to Corinth was still possible.

By the time of the Corinthians' letter to Paul, which, because of travel conditions as well as allusions within Paul's reply, was not until early spring, the impact of two things upon the Corinthian community would now have had time to create fresh disturbances and questions. First was the arrival of Judaizers from Palestine in the late autumn, who, since the Jerusalem conference,

were intent on disrupting the non-Judaizing Gentile mission by undermining Paul's authority (cf. ch. 9) and by segregating his ethnic groups cultically (cf. ch. 8). Second was Titus' work of initiating the offering and of contributing orally from his own experience in Jerusalem and Antioch whatever he could to the cultic discussion about eating which was raised by the Judaizers. The church probably argued all winter about the questions which the opposing sides stirred up, and then drew up a letter which they sent to Paul as soon as travel conditions permitted. This letter presented the questions which had been raised, including the one about his authority, posed by the Judaizers, and which had cast suspicion upon his financial policy which up to this time they had unquestioningly accepted (cf. II Cor. 8:10). The offering at this stage had evidently not flared up into a major issue. I Cor. 9 reflects just those perplexing questions as would be incited by such Judaizers working within the community.²² That at this time Paul had not suspected the loyalty of the church itself could be the background of 11:2, and that he assumed that their questions were sincere is reflected in the way that he dealt with the problems contained in chs. 12-15. He answered their questions about the offering simply, merely confirming the work that Titus was doing, and briefly outlined his plans to conclude his part of the work in the East (16:1-9). The whole series of questions were such as a leader respected by the community would then officially bring to Paul as soon as the seaway opened and would discuss with him as he wrote his reply. This person would then seem to be the one who would naturally be included in the address of such a reply, and this address may also be the one which happens to be placed at the beginning of the canonical letter. Thus this person would seem to be Sosthenes.

Then, by the time Sosthenes returned with these answers, the seaways being open, the Judaizers had probably been arriving in greater numbers and had been doing their subversive work in earnest, so that the church was separating rapidly into factions around various leaders. This more serious situation is reflected in 1:10-4:21, news of which was reported to Paul by Chloe's people (1:11). This news could have been relayed to Paul soon after, or even before, Sosthenes arrived back in Corinth.²³ In this section other workers besides Paul and his own co-workers are named and their groups identified. The question about the stewardship of the mysteries of God (4:1-2) leads to the point where he absolutely refuses to be judged by the Corinthians at all, but instead refers his case to the court of God (4:3-5). He proves his sincerity in his mission with a demonstration of his poverty (evidently the result of pouring his earnings from his livelihood back into the mission), while they, Paul's judges, live like kings (4:8-13). Verses 7-8 could be sarcasm pointed at the attitude that the Corinthians were taking towards the offering for Jerusalem (cf. 4:7; II Cor. 8:9; 9:10-15; Rom. 15:27). He ends (4:14-21), after referring back to why he had first sent Timothy to them, by announcing his intention to come to straighten out matters in person. The allusions indicating that serious trouble was making the visit necessary are in vv. 18-21, "arrogant people", "the kingdom of God does not consist in talk but in power", "come to you with a rod".²⁴

II Cor. 10-13 (cf. II Cor. 2:1; 12:14; 13:1) intimates that Paul went and met difficulties far worse than he had expected. For when Paul arrived in Corinth, he not only became the centre of some vicious attack, but he was in effect charged with attempting a colossal swindle, one which he had been planning and manoeuvring

since the beginning of his missionary campaign (cf. II Cor. 12:16-18). He was therefore faced with a repudiation of his apostleship and even of his claim that he was of Christ (cf. 10:7; 13:3). None of these charges had he been able to rebut successfully while there in person (cf. II Cor. 10:10). Yet evidently he had hopes of regaining control, partly at least through the power of his letter (10-13), for in it he adequately demonstrated his sincerity, powerfully dramatized his devotion to them and to his cause (10:1-12:10, 14-18), and thoroughly established his right to apostleship, and indeed to be their apostle (12:11-13, 19-21). That, and the inclusion of a threat to use Christ's power invested in him to enforce discipline if it should become necessary (13:1-10), was almost all that he himself could do in this critical situation. Paul must have realized that something had happened in Corinth while he was there which tipped the balance in his favour if now he could, with this letter, Titus' mediation, and the influence of his loyal friends in Corinth, only take advantage of it soon enough and forcefully enough to clinch it. It is also evident that he knew that he himself must meanwhile remain physically out of it and only wait for results.²⁵

The rest is obvious. Failure now would mean the end of his programme of ecumenicity--thus his extreme anxiety and impatience displayed in Troas and his decision to rush on to Macedonia to meet Titus so that he could hear the news more quickly, for so much depended upon that news.²⁶

What happened in Corinth can only be conjectured. But according to our chronology, Paul's painful visit to Corinth occurred the spring after his return from his second visit to Jerusalem, i.e., in 49 or 50 by the eleven year method of reckoning, or 52 or 53 by the fourteen year method.²⁷ If any credence is to be given to Acts'

memory that Paul was tried before Gallio (18:12-17), proconsul of Achaia July 51 - July 52,²⁸ then it would have to refer to the same historical situation as Paul's painful visit to Corinth. The seriousness of this event would explain, 1) Paul's change of travel plans (II Cor. 1:15-17a; 2:1-2); 2) the dispatch of II Cor. 10-13 and his reliance upon Titus to effect a reconciliation; 3) Paul's anxiety; 4) his subsequent joy.²⁹

By the eleven year method of reckoning, Paul, at the latest, would have had to appear before Gallio in the spring of 51, which would be impossible if Gallio commenced his office in July, and anyway, even if he commenced it in May, this method of reckoning would make Paul's work in Macedonia exceedingly short, which is unlikely.³⁰ This, therefore, would tend to eliminate the eleven year method as the correct way of reckoning the time between the two Jerusalem visits. By the fourteen year method, figuring back from the spring of 52 (the only spring of Gallio's proconsulship if it commenced in July), Paul was in Jerusalem in 51; thus his first visit to Jerusalem was in 37, and his conversion in 34, which agrees with our previous arguments based on allusions within Paul's letters. If this dating should be correct, then it provides a reason for Paul's fear of the Jews while spending the following winter in Corinth (cf. Rom. 15:30-31), and also suggests that he arrived in Jerusalem about Pentecost, 53.³¹

We have arrived at this date without reliance upon the dating of Felix's or Festus' terms of office, which amongst scholars who attempt to harmonize information given by external sources with that given by Acts varies between 55 and 61.³² It would thus seem sounder to follow the method we have suggested³³ and have followed. In so doing we have seen that Paul's information fits well with

Claudius' edict, dated as 41,³⁴ Gaius' order to place his statue in the Temple at Jerusalem and Claudius' accession,³⁵ Gallio's proconsulship in Achaia,³⁶ and now the dating of Festus' accession at 55 or 56.

It is suggested that as a result of the methodology followed in this study, another reference in Paul's letters which has given trouble to chronologists of Paul now seems to fall into place, and if so, it has bearing on our study of Paul's practice of ecumenism. Many scholars who use Acts as the basis for their chronology find difficulty in placing the vision referred to in II Cor. 12:2 and usually ignore it, or, because of their dating of events, are forced to place it somewhere in the "silent years" when Paul was in Syria and Cilicia, and so to assume that it was not a very significant experience.³⁷ Knox, by using the eleven year method of reckoning, tried to attach it to the conversion experience,³⁸ but later he hesitatingly retracted this.³⁹ By the method used in this study, and according to the chronology so far developed through it, it can (with its use of the preposition *πρό*, meaning "before", "earlier than"⁴⁰) be taken seriously as an experience that was important to Paul, even though for his purpose in II Cor. 10-13 he makes light of it, not because its content was insignificant but because such ecstatic experiences gave neither status nor glory to the individual. Since according to our chronology Paul had been away from Jerusalem for about half a year when he wrote II Cor. 10-13,⁴¹ and since the fourteen years of Gal. 2:1 is probably less than a full fourteen years on the ancient method of reckoning a part of a year as a full year, then *πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων* can mean "before fourteen years ago", i.e., a little more than fourteen years ago (but presumably less than fifteen). So the experience referred to could

be placed in Jerusalem during Paul's first visit there. The import of the experience related in Acts 22:17-21, i.e., the trance in the temple, can also be taken seriously as very important to Paul, since, according to our chronology, it could well be the one that sent him "far away to the Gentiles", that is, beyond the regions presently being reached by other Christians, to regions where he would not be building "on another man's foundation". According to the chronology of Paul's first missionary activity (excluding the first three years in Damascus) argued for in this study, and according to the memory-fragment recorded in Acts 22:17-21, it was during Paul's first visit to Jerusalem that he made his decision to go "far away to the Gentiles". Also according to our chronology and the dating of II Cor. 10-13--and so the time reference of 12:2--this was the same time that Paul had some spectacular vision for which he could give Christ glory but would take none for himself. All point to the same time, and so possibly to the same event that clinched the decision for Paul. The time of that decision, therefore, was not fourteen years later, nor even four,⁴² but then.

The vision in Acts had nothing to do with a second conversion or a change of practice from going to the Jews to going to the Gentiles, for the latter he had surely practised since his conversion; otherwise, why should he have been singled out for arrest by the governor under Aretas (II Cor. 11:32)?⁴³ It was the experience which clinched the decision to go on his own to the Gentiles, and he went, as we have argued, until he found his first opening, viz., in Macedonia. On this basis, the scarcity of information about missionary work by Paul in the regions covered by Acts 15:40-16:12 makes sense. There was none. He was searching for his opening, and Acts 16:9-10 records when that opening came.

The second question following on that of the sequence of events is what the background circumstances of I and II Corinthians reveal about Paul's use of his associates. It is obvious that Paul depended both upon his peripatetic and upon his local co-workers for the promotion and consolidation of his mission. The church in Corinth was apparently closely and spontaneously united, but not by a body of officers. There were self-appointed workers who from natural ability and charisma served the others. Some of these leaders travelled about, e.g., Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, as well as Chloe's people. Whether those travelling went primarily for business and therefore offered their services to the congregations, or were asked by the churches because the members knew that they were going somewhere, or both, (cf. II Cor. 8:16-19), cannot be said. It would seem likely that congregations took advantage of situations whenever business compelled members to travel. At the same time, it seems that usually those found willing to do church work or to represent the church were people of financial or business means (cf. the household of Stephanas, I Cor. 16:15, and Chloe's people, 1:11), and of course people devoted to the service of the church, cf. 16:15, 16.

Διάκονοι. The service performed by deacons cannot be narrowly defined, but rather it covers a wide range of undefined ministry, whether done by itinerants or locals. These workers who are specifically called deacons in Paul's letters are only Phoebe (Rom. 16:1), Apollos and Paul (I Cor. 3:5; cf. Col. 1:25; II Cor. 3:6; 6:4--the last two references, by inference, could include Timothy and others), Epiphras (Col. 1:7), Tychicus (Col. 4:7), Archippus (Col. 4:17), and unnamed ones in Phil. 1:1. Only by using the less preferred readings which include διάκονον τοῦ Θεοῦ can

Ellis⁴⁴ use I Thess. 3:2 as a direct reference for calling Timothy a deacon; but either the word "fellow worker" (συνεργός) or the verb "exhorting" may determine Timothy's function as a deacon. If the former, then why not Euodia and Syntyche in Phil. 4:2, who, with Clement and the others "laboured side by side with me in the gospel" and are "fellow workers" (4:3)? In Phil. 4:3, ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ συνήθλησάν μοι is coupled with συνεργῶν μου. In I Cor. 16:16, κοπιῶντι is bracketed with συνεργοῦντι. Yet I Cor. 16:16 describes the ministry (διακονίαν, v. 15) rendered by Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus. When Paul calls himself and his associates deacons in II Cor. 6:4, he defends their ministry (διακονία) by a long list of qualities and experiences (6:4-10), which indicate that the basic meaning of the word is still "service", "serving", and "being servants". Again, if Timothy is a deacon, then Silvanus and Titus must be included, though they are not specifically named by Paul as deacons in the ministry of the church. Also, with Paul's emphasis on equality between the sexes in Christ and his references to women such as Phoebe as a deacon (Rom. 16:1), Euodia and Syntyche as ones who as "fellow workers" "laboured side by side with me in the gospel" (Phil. 4:2-3), and Prisca and her husband Aquila as "my fellow workers in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 16:3), there can be no restricting of the menial tasks of the church to the women while the men enjoy the preaching.

Δοῦλος. Just because Paul nowhere used the term δοῦλος or σύνδουλος for Titus does not rule out the possibility that Titus was in that category just as much as those whom Paul did so designate, e.g., Tychicus (Col. 4:7), and Timothy (Phil. 1:1). The only one referred to as δοῦλος, other than Timothy, Tychicus, Paul (Rom. 1:1; passim), and Christians generally (cf. I Cor. 7:22),

is Epaphras (σύνδουλος, Col. 1:7, and δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Col. 4:12, the founder and teacher of the church in Colossae, Col. 1:6-7).

Ἀδελφός. That some of those mentioned above have a function which takes them away from local activities, to a service beyond their own community or even to interchurch relations, is apparent in Paul's use of "brothers" in II Cor. 8-9. According to II Cor. 8-9, Paul sent brethren to Corinth with Titus, one of whom was "famous among all the churches for his preaching of the gospel" (8:18), and another whom they had "often tested and found earnest in many matters" (8:22). Both of these brethren seem to be workers whom Paul had already used in other places, and whom he now used for the express purpose of helping him to inspire generosity and confidence in the offering.⁴⁵ Therefore, it seems that much of Paul's use of these terms as they are found in the extant letters is somewhat haphazard. The comparative terminological approach to this problem is not to be pursued without reference to allusions to the historical situations in which the people are involved.

That there were people in positions of leadership is not being denied, even though, as in I Cor. 16:15-18, such leadership may have been by the spontaneous process of self-appointment and mutual recognition. Some such organization may be behind I Thess. 5:11-14. But whether it arose by official appointment by the gathered church (cf. I Cor. 5:4b; I Cor. 16:3; and II Cor. 8:19) or by self-appointment and mutual recognition of abilities (I Cor. 16:15-18; cf. I Cor. 12-14), cannot be said. Responsibility is laid upon all Christians--upon the whole church--to labour in this way with one another. So to this extent, organization in Paul's churches may have been quite spontaneous, co-operative, and functional, and

not at all an official, authoritative hierarchy (cf. also Phil. 2:20-21).⁴⁶

Paul then used Timothy, Silvanus, and Titus (all called "brothers") as close associates working throughout Macedonia and Achaia, founding, developing, and endeavouring to unite the churches in these provinces on Paul's principles. The Corinthian correspondence suggests that Paul used Titus for the work of reconciling the members of the Achaian church with himself, and so of incorporating that congregation into a united church in the world. When the reconciliation had been accomplished, Paul sent Titus back to Corinth to complete the work of the offering which he had commenced the year before (cf. II Cor. 8:6). Thus Paul had associates available, some working in his own immediate circle, like Timothy, Silvanus, and Titus, as well as others more loosely connected with him, upon whom he could call or could depend for important missionary work to be done locally or abroad.

In a corporate sense, Paul did fulfil the object of his original intention to revisit his churches again and again (cf. I Thess. 2:17-18; I Cor. 5:3), though he did so in a much modified way, not in person, but corporately through a group of co-workers who helped him extend, develop, and consolidate his mission field in the East. As the organizational work became more complex, as the fields rapidly expanded (cf. I Thess. 1:6-8; II Cor. 10:15-16), and perhaps as economic circumstances changed, possibly opening new possibilities of how he could more efficiently and more successfully missionize the Gentile world, Paul may have changed his field programme accordingly.

Paul and His Team

Is there, however, evidence in the Pauline letters that indicates that in relation to his co-workers Paul carried out in practice in his organization the principles which he taught and tried to realize in his churches? "Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy" are the first words in the address in the first letter which Paul wrote to the Thessalonians; as also they are in the second. That to the Colossians reads, "Paul, . . . and Timothy"; so, too, does the one to Philemon. I Cor. 1:1 has "Paul" and "Sosthenes"; II Corinthians has "Paul" and "Timothy", and so does Philippians. Timothy and Titus, as has been seen, serve as Paul's associates or co-workers; so does Tychicus in Col. 4:7. Paul's words which introduce Tychicus to the Colossians, "he is a beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow servant in the Lord", are similar to those which he uses to describe Timothy in I Thess. 3:2, "our brother and God's servant in the gospel of Christ". It is proposed for want of a better word to call the group operating in this way a "team".⁴⁷

One might suspect in I Thessalonians that the team is a group in contradistinction to Timothy, for I Thess. 3:1-2 reads, "when we could bear it no longer, we were willing to be left behind at Athens alone, and we sent Timothy, our brother and God's servant in the gospel of Christ" (. . . καὶ ἐπέμψαμεν Τιμόθεον, τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ . . .). But by such terminology Paul also describes his own position, "For we are God's fellow workers" (θεοῦ γὰρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί, I Cor. 3:9).⁴⁸ So, too, Paul says, "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ" (Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Rom. 1:1), and in Phil. 1:1, he includes Timothy, "Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus" (Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ).⁴⁹

An important change in the team's personnel took place after Paul left Corinth, at which time Titus, a Greek, may have filled the vacancy created by Silvanus' departure. Titus appears to have carried on where Silvanus left off, a helper for Paul, and one whom Paul introduced to the other apostles when he made his visit to Jerusalem after working for a time in Ephesus. The team relationship, however, appears to have remained throughout Paul's missionary activity among the churches which he established in Macedonia-Achaia, as the Thessalonian and Corinthian correspondence testify.

Paul's Use of "We". In his earlier letters, Paul almost always writes in the first person plural and frequently does so in his later letters. Our discussion so far of Paul's use of his associates raises the question how the first person plural is to be interpreted in his letters. Is the "we" epistolary, or is it genuine? This is a difficult question, and considerable literature has been written upon it. Except for those instances where Paul includes his readers or Christians in general, many have taken this "we" to be epistolary. Others, however, have suggested that it should be taken as a genuine plural in which Paul includes his associates with himself.⁵⁰ If this is so, his use of pronouns may shed further light upon the question how much he applied his ecumenical principles to his own relationships, especially with his team. Though Paul obviously composes the letters, they are nevertheless intended to be from the entire team, as the addresses state, and as he indicates in his warning to his readers about pseudo-letters, "we beg you, brethren, not to be quickly shaken . . . by letter purporting to be from us" (II Thess. 2:1-2). Note also II Thess. 2:15, "stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter." (Cf. also

II Thess. 3:6; II Cor. 1:19.)

In I Thess. 1:5-6a, there is strong indication that Paul conceived of the work of the three as that of a team, "for our gospel came to you not only in word, but also in power You know what kind of men we proved to be among you for your sake. And you became imitators of us". Likewise in 2:1-2, "our visit to you was not in vain; . . . we had courage in our God to declare to you the gospel of God in the face of great opposition." In comparison with sophists, the team acted responsibly and was careful to dissociate itself from such methods. In other words, as the entire passage 2:2-12 illustrates, what the preceding chapter in this study has claimed for Paul must likewise be claimed for the team. The team was "ready to share with you not only the gospel of God but also our own selves, because you had become very dear to us" (2:8).

So also in I Thess. 2:17-20, it would seem to be the team that speaks. Here Paul, in the eagerness of his love for the Thessalonians, inserts a personal aside, "I, Paul, again and again", not only underlining his own feeling towards them, but unconsciously also the view which he holds that the three act and think together. In 3:1-5, in juxtaposition to Διὸ μηκέτι στέγοντες ἡὺδοκήσαμεν . . . (3:1) is διὰ τοῦτο κἀγὼ μηκέτι στέγων ἔπεμψα . . . (3:5), where the contrasts of στέγοντες and κἀγὼ στέγων would seem to indicate the presence of a genuine "we" in verses 1-4. Rigaux points to the naturalness of the transition between verses 1-4 and 5. The "we", he says, is genuine; and the κἀγὼ reveals Paul's personal feelings towards the recipients.⁵¹ In that case it would seem that in this passage, too, the "we" refers to the team, whether at first to the three (vv. 1a, 4, 5c), or after Timothy had gone, to the two left behind at Athens (vv. 1b-2). So when in 3:1-4 Paul testifies

that they could no longer bear the strain, it is suggested that it was the team, as a team, that decided to send one of its members (the one elected being Timothy) to represent them at Thessalonica, while the other two remained behind at Athens. Timothy is not, therefore, servant of a team that does not include him, but the bona fide member of the team that in him corporately made the journey. Timothy thus represented himself as well as the other two who were unable to accompany him. So, too, one is to understand that when Timothy returned to report, he reported to the team as a member of it (3:6-8).

In constantly referring to Paul as though the letters are permeated only with the mind of Paul and not at all with that of the team, Rigaux, in his commentary, reflects the prevailing practice among commentators, even though he recognizes the genuineness of the "we". It is true that Paul prefers to disappear into the group, as Rigaux says, but not for the sake of anonymity, the reason that he gives; but rather, we suggest, because Paul desires to carry out in his relations with other Christians, and especially in this regard with all who work in the church's mission, particularly with those who work with him as partners of a team, the principle of equality of status which he declares is included in his gospel (I Cor. 3:8-9; 16:10b; II Cor. 8:23). Consequently, when one reads in I Thess. 3:11, "Now may our God and Father himself, and our Lord Jesus, direct our way to you", one should understand that Paul is speaking for the group. In all sincerity the group hoped to return to Thessalonica, probably soon, so that, as 3:10 reads, "we may see you face to face and supply what is lacking in your faith". So the team, as a team, though sometimes represented only by an individual, or possibly at other times by combinations of helpers, such as Timothy

and Silvanus (cf. Acts 18:5), made visitations. Nevertheless, with these visitations Paul himself is always identified.⁵²

Next to be examined for indications of this team concept are the letters which stem from Paul's residence in Ephesus, beginning with the last letters that Paul wrote while he was still at work in the East, namely, those now contained in I and II Corinthians which refer to his work in Achaia. It has been noted that by the time these letters were written, Silvanus had dropped out of this area of work; in the address in I Corinthians another person, Sosthenes, is mentioned in place of the original team, and Timothy's name is absent. This may be because the editor chose the address that belonged to the most important letter in the original series (i.e., Paul's answer to the Corinthians' letter, whose bearer was an important person in the Corinthian church) to be the address for the one that he was compiling as I Corinthians; and also because the editor knew that by the time of the sending of that letter Timothy was supposed to be en route to Corinth via Macedonia. Although Titus is now involved in the Corinthian work, he is not mentioned in this letter; but inasmuch as the letters that compose I Corinthians lie between the Jerusalem visit reported in Galatians, where Titus is mentioned, and the remainder of the Corinthian correspondence, i.e., II Corinthians, where he is also named, it may be assumed that Titus is now part of the team.

In I Corinthians, Paul continues to refer to the work that was done in Corinth as work done by the team, even to the point of the methods of instruction used by them. The team imparts the wisdom of the Spirit for the more mature, "And we impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit" (2:13; cf. 2:6).⁵³ Yet in spite of this, the Corinthians have fallen under

the sway of a knowledge which puffs them up, and which they did not receive from Paul or his helpers, for, he says, "Without us you have become kings!" (I Cor. 4:8).⁵⁴

Some scholars maintain that following the dispatch of I Corinthians new information comes from Corinth, which causes Paul to write again in a gentle yet forthright manner explaining the way in which he and his helpers had worked in Achaia when they first ministered amongst them (i.e., II Cor. 2:14-7:4).⁵⁵ In this section Paul refreshes the Corinthians' minds that the team cannot be compared to those who, like sophists, peddle God's word, for he writes,

But thanks be to God, who in Christ always leads us in triumph, and through us spreads the fragrance of the knowledge of him everywhere. . . . For we are not, like so many, peddlers of God's word; but as men of sincerity, as commissioned by God, in the sight of God we speak in Christ. (II Cor. 2:14-17)⁵⁶

Throughout this section it is "we" who preached, "us" for whom the Corinthians themselves are letters of recommendation (3:2), and especially, "you show that you are a letter from Christ delivered by us, written . . . on tablets of human hearts" (3:3).⁵⁷ Paul continues, "our competence is from God, who has made us competent to be ministers of a new covenant" (3:5-6).⁵⁸ Then after a long, tangential discourse, he returns to the team's method of ministry,

Since we have such a hope, we are very bold, . . .

 Therefore, having this ministry by the mercy of God, we do not lose heart. We have renounced disgraceful, underhanded ways; . . . For what we preach is not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, with ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake. (II Cor. 3:12-4:5)

Paul is speaking to a specific situation in the Corinthian church. He is explaining and defending his and his colleagues' ways and methods of missionizing in Corinth since they began their work

there. Thus the "we" in this section is not to be taken in the sense of Paul alone, but of Paul identified with his helpers, and therefore of the work as work done by the helpers and by Paul labouring together as a team with Christ, "So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. . . . Working together with him, then, we entreat you not to accept the grace of God in vain" (Ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν ὥς τοῦ Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν. . . . Συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν. . . II Cor. 5:20-6:1).⁵⁹

It is therefore suggested that in II Cor. 6:11-13; 7:2-4 Paul continues to speak for each member of his team who works with the Corinthians, and not for himself alone as most commentators assume. These verses are the conclusion of the whole section, 2:14-7:4 (omitting 6:14-7:1), in which he appears to have been concerned with the team throughout. Why should he suddenly separate himself in the climax from his colleagues? His approach to the Corinthians here is no doubt very personal, but is not that also true in regard to the other members of the group who worked in intimate contact with them? Paul, as the writer (which is partly the significance of v. 13, "I speak as to children"), has told them everything; his own heart to be sure is wide open for giving and receiving affection. But this is also true, for example, of Timothy, who has ministered to them in this spirit (II Cor. 1:19-22), and for whom in I Cor. 16:10-11 Paul pleads for exactly this kind of treatment. Indeed, the very interruption in 6:13, "I speak as to children", a personal remark in the context of a continuous flow of first person plurals, strengthens the case for the genuine character of the plural itself (cf. I Thess. 3:1, 5). In the same manner in II Cor. 7:2 he again returns to the thread of the appeal, "Open your

hearts to us; we have wronged no one" (cf. II Cor. 12:17-18 where specific wrongs are countered and specific associates named). Once more he adds his own personal word, and even as he does so he phrases it semitically, identifying himself with the particular corporate missionary group with whom he works, "for I said before that you are in our hearts, to die together and to live together" (II Cor. 7:3).⁶⁰

In II Cor. 10-13, Paul uses a more direct, personal approach than in his previous correspondence. In comparison with other letters in the Corinthian collection, this may be partly because of the personal nature of the attack which had been made upon him by his opponents. But even so, there are overtones of (and some direct references to) a team carrying on the mission (cf. II Cor. 10:4-6).

Thus Paul, though speaking for himself, yet speaks for others with whom he is identified when he writes, "For even if I boast a little too much of our authority, which the Lord gave for building you up" (II Cor. 10:8). Here the "our", from the Corinthians' viewpoint, would naturally refer to the associates who work with Paul. This identification is borne out in vv. 13-16. The "we" throughout this passage could therefore well refer to those who are directly responsible for the church in this area and for its extension beyond itself, and with whom Paul has the strongest feeling of solidarity or identification in the work going on in his own areas of missionary endeavour (cf. also II Cor. 11:4). The passage then refers to a refusal of the whole group to work in areas where other bona fide apostolic evangelization is taking place.⁶¹ Paul may have had an interest in other Gentile areas, e.g., Asia and provinces farther east. He may also have had some special relationship with the apostles who carry on missionary work in these regions.

These further relationships, however, are different from those of the group with whom he identifies himself in II Cor. 10:7-16 and in the previous passages so far examined; nor do they concern competitors whom he censures in this letter. "Work already done in another's field" is undoubtedly an implicit rebuke to those in Paul's territory who are probably from other provinces who are attempting to lay foundations other than the one that Paul has laid, and who are breaking the church up into segregated groups.

When Paul attempts to clear himself of the charges which his opponents level at him, and when he contrasts his work with that of the imposters who use methods of sophistry, and when he reminds his Corinthian congregation how he refrains from burdening them while his adversaries prey upon them, he also reveals that what is his own procedure is also the practice of his whole team (cf. II Cor. 11:12 and vv. 20-21). Even though Paul is writing in his own defence, it is difficult for him to maintain the singular. Inadvertently, he swings back and forth from the first person singular to the first person plural; the individual and the group with which he is identified are one. Mention of Titus (II Cor. 12:18), whom Paul had sent to Achaia to minister to the Corinthians' needs, and who worked in the same spirit as Paul, taking the same steps as he himself had done and so would have done, immediately identifies Paul with the team again (v. 19).

In his final correspondence to the Corinthians (i.e., II Cor. 1:3-2:13; 7:5-16; 8:1-9:15), this concept is still present. In this letter Paul rejoices that all is now well between himself and the Corinthians. All his and the team's suffering has been for the comfort and salvation of the members of the churches, in this case, of the Corinthian church (II Cor. 1:6).⁶² When he writes to

them, the team writes to them (1:13). His planning has been the team's planning; his preaching, the team's preaching. Such is the strength and reality of this oneness (1:17-19).

The Fellow Travellers. In this same letter Paul refers to a time just past when supposedly he had been travelling alone (cf. II Cor. 2:12-13), and had been awaiting the arrival of Titus. It is surprising therefore to read that Paul evidently had companions with him at the time, for in II Cor. 7:5-7 he uses the first person plural pronouns again.⁶³ There seem to have been other travellers involved, i.e., "we came into Macedonia". These fellow travellers are equally anxious and concerned, e.g., "comforted us by the coming of Titus". They are present with Paul when Titus related the news, "he told us"; though of course the news directly concerned Paul's relations with Corinth, as "your zeal for me, so that I rejoiced still more" indicates. This information needs to be examined further to determine their relationship to Paul, to each other, and to the missionary programme.

Paul is coming from Ephesus, his centre of residence and work for the past few years. He is going via Macedonia to Corinth and from there to Jerusalem and then on to Spain (cf. I Cor. 16:5-6; II Cor. 1:16; Rom. 15:24-25, 28). Titus had previously gone on his mission from Ephesus to Corinth. Now Paul says, "we rejoiced still more at the joy of Titus, because his mind has been set at rest by you all. . . . so our boasting before Titus has proved true"

(. . . οὕτως καὶ ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Τίτου ἀλήθεια ἐγενήθη, II Cor. 7:13-14). Those who boasted before Titus were not Corinthians, nor is "our" editorial for Paul. Therefore, the former "we" of 7:13 and the latter "our" of 7:14 may refer to the same people, in which case these fellow travellers who are with Paul

in Macedonia, and who arrived there with him, know Titus well and have boasted with Paul about the true nature of the Corinthians. Titus had understandably been doubtful about that church and had to be persuaded, after having returned to Ephesus, to make the journey again (II Cor. 7:13-15). The most likely conclusion to be drawn from this evidence is that in Ephesus these fellow travellers helped Paul to persuade Titus to go back to Corinth. Thus at that time they acted as part of a missionary team that worked with Paul from Ephesus. The team with which they may have been more closely allied may have been one that worked with the Asian churches rather than with Paul's own churches in Macedonia and Achaia, since seemingly they are not known to the Corinthians, or Paul would have named them, instead of introducing them merely by referring to their qualifications (cf. II Cor. 8:18-19, 22).

Other evidence for the significance of the usage of the first person plural in the above passage (II Cor. 7:5-7) can be seen in the address, "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, and Timothy our brother" (II Cor. 1:1). According to I Cor. 4:17; 16:10-11, Paul had sent Timothy to Corinth, probably via a long tour of the Macedonian churches. Nowhere is there any report about how successfully the mission turned out, although as far as the Macedonian churches are concerned, he succeeded very well, as evidenced by the spirit and relative size of their contribution (II Cor. 8:1-5). Nor is it said that he returned to Ephesus. But I Cor. 16:11 gives the impression that Paul expected him relatively soon. Therefore, it may be conjectured that Timothy reached Ephesus in time to join Paul on this return journey to Jerusalem via Macedonia and Corinth.⁶⁴

Corporate Action of the Group. Inasmuch as II Cor. 8 and 9

follow very closely upon the previous letter, if they are not postscripts to it or indeed part of it, the same brethren mentioned there, who, as has been suggested above, were possibly included in the team which had earlier decided to send Titus back to Corinth from Ephesus, are very likely now included with Paul and Timothy in the informal but corporate council which arrived at the decision to send Titus back to Corinth from Macedonia to complete the work in which "he had already made a beginning", for it states, "we have urged Titus" (8:6). This same group, still acting corporately, also decided that certain of its members, i.e., "the brother who is famous among all the churches for his preaching of the gospel" (8:18) and the "brother whom we have often tested" (8:22), should accompany Titus to Corinth to promote the collection. It may be noted that Paul does not claim that he made these decision by himself, but like the one made at Ephesus, and the much earlier one made in regard to Timothy and Thessalonica, they were corporate. It may be surmised that consultation took place in each of the cases studied. The unanimity of decision in the case of II Cor. 8:16-18, 22, was so spontaneous that any discussion in council was hardly necessary. Yet it reflects a common mind and remains a common decision.

The corporate spirit is likewise evident in Paul's "severe letter", "I urged Titus to go" (παρεκάλεσα Τίτον, II Cor. 12:13). Though in this context Paul is taking the initiative and assuming full responsibility, he still uses a word, παρακαλεῖν, which indicates that a discussion between the two had taken place, the result of which is not due to a command or request, but to a begging or beseeching or urging. Here, then, is an allusion to freedom of decision on the part of members of the group, or a relationship in

which those involved act as corporate members. This relationship which distinguishes such corporate action can be noted when a difference of opinion is registered, and the group still functions in the spirit of solidarity. Titus obviously responds to the prodding, but "our brother Apollos" does not (I Cor. 16:12). The relationship of Paul and Apollos will be studied more fully in the next chapter.

Team Solidarity. Team solidarity is clearly visible in the work itself, the methods used, the preaching of the gospel, and the teaching carried on. When present together, they prayed together (I Thess. 1:2; cf. 5:25; also II Thess. 1:11; 2:13).⁶⁵ In Colossians, this sense of oneness spread beyond the circle of missionaries orientated to the Macedonian-Achaian churches to include those workers especially related to churches of the province of Asia (cf. Col. 1:7-9).⁶⁶ There, in reverse, Paul asks the congregation to "pray for us", that is, to pray for the missionary team (Col. 4:3; cf. I Thess. 5:25) in which he identifies himself as an integral member, as may be gathered from his immediate change from the first person plural to the first person singular as he applies their prayer to himself (cf. Col. 4:4).

Likewise, the gospel that is preached is "our gospel", i.e., "the gospel of God" (I Thess. 1:5; 2:2, 8, 9; II Thess. 2:14). The power and conviction with which the gospel is preached possessed them all. It is the "Son of God, Jesus Christ" whom the three, Silvanus, Timothy, and Paul together proclaimed in Corinth (II Cor. 1:19, i.e., "the gospel of Christ", 10:14), and preached in concord. Indeed, they served as one, as may be gathered from II Cor. 11:4 (cf. also II Cor. 2:17).

In similar vein Paul writes to the Galatians and declares, "if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel

contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed" (Gal. 1:8). This instance of the use of the first person plural pronoun is the only exception in this letter to his use of the first person singular. Even if Paul did evangelize North Galatia all alone, still in the light of his other letters, this "we" is not to be construed as an epistolary "we", but must be accounted for in some other way. Either a companion not of the team accompanied him so that the "we" inadvertently slips in, or it is to be explained as a natural lapse into the plural by one who constantly thinks in this way. Paul is very likely writing this letter from Ephesus, where he is surrounded by, and identifies himself with, his fellow workers who have shared the evangelization of all his other areas with him, and with whom he works from Ephesus. This is undoubtedly the significance of the second half of the address, "and all the brethren who are with me" (Gal. 1:2).⁶⁷ So he evidently includes them in the supposition, "But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel". If that should be so, then this "we" implies the team who shares with him the propagation of the gospel. The gospel preached in Galatia, as far as Paul is concerned, is still the gospel "which we preached to you", even though he may have been, in this instance, its sole exponent (cf. Gal. 1:6, 11-12; 4:13). Hence, not only is Paul represented in the work of his associates, but likewise they are represented in his work.

In addition, it is the whole team that suffers affliction. It is a solidarity felt and shared by the others for the one (cf. I Cor. 12:26). So, too, in II Cor. 2:14-7:4, possibly a separate letter to the Corinthians, 4:8-12 is not a description of a general Christian experience, but a depiction of apostles (cf. I Cor. 4:9), especially those with whom Paul may have worked in close co-opera-

tion, but more specifically, as may be perceived from the introductory remarks (II Cor. 3:1-3), of Paul and the team of fellow workers⁶⁸ with whom he is closely identified. The nature of the trouble that faces Paul in Corinth calls from him a defence of the ministry which the team had carried on in that area. Yet in spite of the team's suffering (cf. 6:3-10), he can write in this letter to the Corinthians, "With all our affliction, I am overjoyed" (II Cor. 7:4, again the juxtaposition of the plural and the singular underlines the genuineness of the plural). So also in the Asian theatre of action, there are overtones of this same sharing of suffering in the missionary task (cf. Col. 4:7-9). Thus the team lives a corporate life in complete solidarity of purpose and experience.

Paul affirms that the entire team received their ministry directly from God (e.g., II Cor. 2:17; 4:1; 5:18-19). How his co-workers came by their commission he does not say, but he does not make any claim at all that he commissioned them himself or that any other apostle commissioned them. It is God who commissioned not just Paul, but Timothy and Silvanus as well--and by implication, Titus who joined the team later than the first missionary period to which Paul refers. "God . . . has commissioned us; he has put his seal upon us and given us his Spirit in our hearts as a guarantee" (II Cor. 1:21-22). This is the qualification and certificate necessary for the work.⁶⁹ Thus, "we work with you for your joy" (1:24).

One is led to assume, therefore, that preachers and evangelists arose when and where the Spirit moved them, and that Paul and other co-workers considered them to be commissioned by God after they had proved themselves as "tested" preachers (cf. II Cor. 8:22) whose gospel was not "contrary to that which we preached to

you" (Gal. 1:8; cf. I Cor. 3:11), and who preached "in power and in the Holy Spirit and with full conviction" (I Thess. 1:5). From then on they were incorporated into a team. It is as though they served an apprenticeship or, at least, were closely observed or examined before being so admitted, since whenever Paul refers to members of his team, they seem already "tested", already preach "in power", and already preach a gospel not "contrary". Thus this final stage of acceptance by the group was only the team's outward recognition of an inner reality already present and existing from a sphere beyond human control (cf. II Cor. 3:5-11).⁷⁰

In I Cor. 15:6 Paul testifies that more than five hundred at one time witnessed the resurrected Christ. We do not know who these were, but many could have been missionaries on their own. Yet nowhere does Paul identify any of his immediate fellow workers with such witnesses of the resurrection.⁷¹ Therefore, however these partners may have come into the Pauline group, he would seem to include them in his affirmation of II Cor. 1:21-22. So Paul asserts, "we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us" (II Cor. 5:20).⁷² Like all true servants of the One whom they represent, the team can say, "we commend ourselves in every way: . . ." (II Cor. 6:4-10). Therefore, it would seem that there is sufficient evidence to justify the conclusion that throughout Paul's missionary career, as regards his own territory of Macedonia and Achaia, from the beginning of his missionary work in Philippi, which commenced soon after his first meeting with Peter in Jerusalem, until the conclusion of his work in the East about fifteen years later, at which time he set off for Spain via Jerusalem, Paul worked with and identified himself with a missionary band, a corporate group, which we have called a team.⁷³

Work for a Livelihood

From the beginning of Paul's missionary programme, soon after he embarked upon his career in North Macedonia to preach to the Gentiles, he set up some kind of business or engaged in some trade or craft in order to support himself.⁷⁴ He found employment in Macedonia, i.e., at least in Thessalonica. This may be gathered from his claim to the Thessalonians that he toiled night and day while he was with them in order not to be a financial burden to them (I Thess. 2:9). That does not mean that at this stage in his career he was financially independent of outside help, since he admits that in Thessalonica he received help from the Philippians "once and again" (Phil. 4:16).⁷⁵ Although there is no evidence about work during his residence in Philippi, yet in keeping with the spirit of the rule which he followed in the case of the Thessalonians (I Thess. 2:9; II Thess. 3:7-12), it would be strange if he did not abide by it in the city in which he lived just prior to his coming to Thessalonica. In fact, Phil. 4:15-16 intimates by its silence that when he resided there Paul did not receive aid from them, which would therefore seem to indicate that he was able to find employment. At least the people in Philippi seemingly responded wholeheartedly to Paul's gospel and occasionally, when he was in special need elsewhere, supported him in his missionary endeavours, which support he in no way rejected per se (cf. I Cor. 9:4-12; Phil. 4:10-20; II Thess. 3:9).⁷⁶ Such help probably enabled him to remain in an area longer than otherwise he might have been able to remain for financial reasons. Paul's dependence upon aid in such instances was undoubtedly partly due to the effect that the general economic conditions of the area in which he worked had upon his own power to provide always for his needs even by long hours at his trade, and was not

due to insufficient effort expended on his part in earning his livelihood (cf. II Thess. 3:7-8).⁷⁷ With that extra help he could then continue to work in the mission of the church (cf. Phil. 1:5-7; 4:14-17) and still seriously endeavour to earn his own way, which in Thessalonica he must have been able to do quickly; for in II Thessalonians, in chastening the idle class, Paul could honestly give himself as an example of industry. Unlike the idlers, he and his helpers "did not eat any one's bread without paying, but with toil and labour . . . worked night and day" in order not to burden anyone (II Thess. 3:8).⁷⁸

Paul's economic policy was to be financially independent of outside control over his missionary procedures; cf. I Cor. 9:19 (15-23).⁷⁹ Quite likely he had brought his trade with him into the mission field. So when he finally reached Philippi, and then Thessalonica, he either hired himself out in a shop of his craft, or set up a business of his own. When he moved to Corinth, he may have accepted help from his friends back in Philippi until he was financially established, and, if economic conditions sometimes left him in want (cf. II Cor. 11:9; Phil. 4:12, 15), then until matters improved for him after he moved to Ephesus. In his letters there is the allusion that in some way he was vitally connected with Prisca and Aquila (cf. Rom. 16:3-4; I Cor. 16:19). What that connection was, he himself does not say.⁸⁰

It is striking how precisely the rest of the team conforms to Paul's practice. From the beginning, the group of fellow workers with whom he is associated worked for a living. So much stress has been laid upon the fact that Paul claims this prerogative for himself, that commentators take little note of the fact that he claims it for the others as well.⁸¹ As early as his mission in Macedonia

it was so (cf. I Thess. 2:9). Paul was not ashamed of this work, nor were they; he even stresses that it consumed long hours, "we worked night and day, that we might not burden any of you";⁸² that means Timothy and Silvanus as well as Paul. Then towards the end of his missionary career in the East, he declares the same policy towards the Corinthians, with the clear implication that this has always been his and the team's approach to the practical problem of human sustenance, "To the present hour . . . we labour, working with our own hands" (I Cor. 4:11-12a).

In this respect, certain things have to be kept in mind: 1) the need to eat; 2) that while travelling around, one cannot really work; 3) Paul's claim that all the team worked with their hands; 4) that while the team evangelized within a territory, no remuneration was received from that territory for any evangelism done within it. Then the question must be asked, how did Timothy and Titus exist while travelling, and the brethren while moving about? Did Paul help finance them by the fruits of his own toil? Was the graciousness of the Philippian church the source? The Philippians, however, seem only to have sent their gifts to Paul (II Cor. 11:9; Phil. 4:10, 14-18), and then only when he seems to have been in some special need (cf. II Cor. 11:9; Phil. 4:10c), though, of course, his needs and the needs of his team would be closely linked.

There may be evidence in I Cor. 16:10-11, where Paul writes to the congregation, "When Timothy comes, see that you put him at ease among you Speed him on his way in peace". Apart from the direct reference to friendly and respectful treatment which is expected from the Corinthians to help Timothy's peace of mind, this passage may have other overtones. Since this visit to Corinth is

not to be a long one, working in some shop in order to pay his way is out of the question. So the churches may be expected to be gracious hosts, and as such to see the helpers off to their next place. This may also be suggested in vv. 15-16 where Stephanas and household are said to "have devoted themselves to the service of the saints", meaning not only to those converts in Achaia, but also to those travelling through (cf. Rom. 16:1-2, 23), especially to team members not at the time considered resident workers.⁸³ But this could not be done too often, or for very long, or Paul's claim that they paid their own way would seem fraudulent to his readers, and especially to his opponents. On the whole, therefore, reliance upon the graciousness of the hosts to provide material assistance so that the team members may travel extensively, must be ruled out, since it clashes with Paul's claims and evident policy, and especially with his assertion of the opposite in II Cor. 11:7-12.

As far as the Corinthian church is concerned, Timothy is on church business; but this does not necessarily define or restrict the purpose of his journey. It cannot be ruled out that Paul's assistants were not only occupied in the work of the church when they travelled about, but were also on private business missions as well. It is extremely difficult to understand how they kept body and soul together, refrained from being a burden to any one, and at the same time travelled so much, unless perhaps they did what Paul said they did, that is, toiled night and day.⁸⁴ All that is known is what Paul says, which includes his remark in I Cor. 4:11 that as a group they remained signally poor, i.e., hungry (πεινῶμεν), thirsty (διψῶμεν), ill-clad (literally naked, γυμνιτεύομεν).

Thus the principles of ecumenism that were preached by Paul and his team were effectively incorporated in the actual organization

of their missionary work. One perceives that their evangelistic programme was organized around the Hebraic view that the eschatological people of God is a single congregation destined in eschatological times to be world embracing. Inasmuch as for Paul the eschatological reign of the Messiah has come, and inasmuch as the church in the world is the nucleus of that eschatological people, therefore that eschatological congregation has as its mission as the body of Christ in the world not only ultimately to encompass the human race and on terms of ethnic and social equality, but also during that mission to witness to the world that they are themselves corporately united and equal brethren in Christ. It has been argued in this chapter, that Paul incorporated these principles into the structure and operation of his own field activities. His team was a corporate group, multiethnic, socially and economically equal, one in spirit, one in message, one in method of work, and one in labouring to consolidate the churches in their own provinces and to unite them in the one church universal.

CHAPTER V

ECUMENICITY OF PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP

In the preceding chapters it has been argued that Paul conceived of the church as the eschatological community, which in Christ is already socially and racially ecumenical, and which has as its mission not only the proclamation of the gospel to the οἰκουμένη but also the announcing of this ecumenicity to the world and the realizing of it in the church itself. It was also argued that Paul himself incorporated these principles in his organization of co-workers, and that he endeavoured to take these principles seriously in his own relationship to them.

If this is so, then it seems that Paul may have recaptured here the psychology of solidarity so integral to the mind of ancient Israel. As, however, in the idealized structure of old Israel, when situations required it, some strong personality emerged to dominate the social unit, only to disappear into its ranks again and to be hidden in the oneness of the group, so in Paul's letters there is evidence that he looked upon his own position in the church in a similar way.¹ Indeed, it may be argued that this awareness of his functional importance only emerged as current problems and circumstances thrust him to the forefront. This development becomes apparent if his letters are examined individually with special attention to their sequence in the chronology previously suggested.

The Significance of "I" Passages in Paul's
Letters to His Own Churches

Practically the whole of Paul's first letters to one of his first churches, that of the Thessalonians, is "we" conscious. Only three times in I Thessalonians, i.e., 2:18; 3:5; 5:27, and twice in II Thessalonians, i.e., 2:5; 3:17, does Paul deviate from this mode of speaking. In I Thess. 2:18 he is underlining his sharing the desire of others, and is expressing his consciousness of the bond that unites him to the group.² In 3:5 he indicates his own anxiety about the Thessalonians, which he has already shown to be shared by the others (cf. 3:1). He has to find out how the Thessalonians' faith is meeting the test of affliction. There is definite indication that he is the one who suggests this enquiry (cf. 3:5). At the close of the letter, 5:27, Paul assumes the responsibility of directing that all the brethren read it. In the personal testimony in II Thess. 2:5, he recalls that he himself had explained to them what the order of events would be in the last days. Then, as the one who composed the letter, he again writes his own personal greeting (3:17).³

Thus from these first two letters one has the impression that this missionary venture is a corporate enterprise and that Paul has not much more prominence in the group than that of being its correspondent, its articulate spokesman, who inserts short, personal notes and, at the end, his own greetings. Basing one's judgment upon these letters alone, one could hardly say that at this early stage in his career Paul as yet desires to be a dominant figure in his missionary team or in the total missionary movement.

I Corinthians, on the other hand, gives one a different impression, for Paul obviously has here emerged as the undisputed,

dominant character. The very accusations made against him requiring his masterful replies imply that the congregation in Achaia recognize him as the chief of the group, not just its spokesman. Thus they address remarks to him, for they know who the mind is behind the mission that operates from Ephesus, even though he himself may not have visited them again. In return, Paul accepts the charges as directed to himself and assumes the responsibility for answering them. So, too, Chloe's people report to Paul that quarrelling is going on amongst the Corinthians (I Cor. 1:11), and it is Paul who appeals for a united mind (1:10).

Yet it is in this very quarrelling that Paul isolates the problem, and it is precisely at this point that he recognizes that his whole ecumenical mission is at stake, that his concept of the church as the "body of Christ" stands or falls, and that he is in danger of running in vain. For the Corinthians themselves are individualizing the proclamation of the gospel and fragmenting the community of Christ, which is a contradiction in terms. They are grouping themselves around those individuals who evangelized them, as around troop leaders. This is the antithesis of community solidarity which Paul expects the "team leaders" to maintain with one another before the one, true, uniting head, Christ Jesus (I Cor. 1:13, et passim).⁴ But wherever in his letters Paul has the opportunity to correct this error, he points out to them that it was his team acting in a united effort that was the instrument by which they themselves were called into the church. For it is against this very fragmentation of the Corinthian church that Paul is able to demonstrate his concept of community solidarity by drawing these cliques together into the fundamental oneness in which their universal equality is found:

I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the growth. So neither he who plants nor he who waters is anything, but only God who gives the growth. He who plants and he who waters are equal, . . . For we are God's fellow workers; . . . (I Cor. 3:6-9)

The personal nature of the trouble which Paul wishes to correct by appeal to a corporate responsibility can be detected in the way he sums up his argument, "I have applied all this to myself and Apollos for your benefit, brethren, that you may learn by us not to go beyond what is written" (I Cor. 4:6).⁵ The dominant figures around whom the disputes centre should be regarded as "servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God" (4:1). This has been made a personal matter by the Corinthians, not by Paul. They have judged Paul; so he defends himself, "with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged by you or by any human court. . . . It is the Lord who judges me" (4:3-4). They have isolated him from other apostles, have separated him from his team, and "have countless guides in Christ"; nevertheless he insists that they are his children (4:14-15). They criticize his teaching of them; so he defends the methods which he used in his own mission (3:2). By so doing he defends his team.⁶

In spite of the fact, however, that much of I Corinthians is a rebuttal of the Corinthians' charges directed against Paul, and even though for that reason the letter is written in self-defence, there is nevertheless a distinct change of emphasis from that which was noted in I and II Thessalonians as to his position within the team. Now Paul says that as father-founder of the Corinthian congregation he, on hearing about these troubles, sent Timothy to remind them "of my ways in Christ, as I teach them everywhere in every church", and he calls Timothy "my beloved and faithful child in the Lord" (cf. 4:15-17). Paul refers to himself as the model for

the Corinthians to imitate (cf. 4:16; 7:7-8; 10:33-11:1 and I Thess. 1:5-6; 2:10; II Thess. 3:7, 9). He is the one whom they must fear, the one who wields the rod (4:19, 21), who pronounces judgment on moral offenders (5:1-5), who gives directions and orders (cf. 11:17, 34), who governs by writing letters (5:9-11), who makes the rules for the churches (7:17), who can be depended upon as their reliable guide (ch. 7). In fact, he is their apostle, and they are the seal of his apostleship (9:1-2). Thus passage after passage seems to point to Paul as the principal missionary for this area and to Timothy as the messenger-assistant, much as in the traditional view.

Throughout this letter, however, Paul's use of the first person singular is excusable and understandable even in view of his emphasis on team solidarity, for in I Cor. 9:3 one is again made aware of the personal nature of the tension and quarrels in Corinth. The Corinthians have evidently been questioning his right, indeed, denying him the right to speak at all as a valid apostle. To attack him at this point, of course, attacks the whole group of missionaries of whom he is an integral part. To strike one is to strike all, especially if that one should be the one who, as his opponents see things, gives to the group its special quality, since he is the one who, for this group, has "seen Jesus our Lord" (9:1).⁷

Jewish Christians had come to Corinth claiming to represent the Jerusalem apostles, especially claiming to be from Peter.⁸ For Paul it was not entirely a question therefore of apostleship according to his own definition, but according to the added qualifications that these contenders were positing as necessary for true apostleship, that they were intimating Paul lacked, and that Paul had not demanded, nor was he now demanding, of his missionaries, but which he could nevertheless match and even far outdo so far as concerns

his present opponents (cf. I Cor. 15:10-11; II Cor. 11:1-12:13). It is in this situation that the prerequisites which qualified one to be an apostle and enabled one to form a church and to gather converts were being more restrictively defined by Paul's opponents. Therefore, it is on this basis that the team's claim to such right could also be shattered.

The other team members in this emerging crisis probably could not by themselves produce the requirements. They depended upon Paul for those requisites that were demanded by the opposition, for he alone could meet them. But--and here comes the crux of the matter--having done this, he at the same time removes the ground upon which his opponents stand. It is not upon Apollos or Peter or Paul that one builds the community, he says, but upon Christ alone.⁹ By so saying, he substantiates the right of his team to preach solely because their call came from God, and not as needing his apostleship for a foundation of their authority to preach. Commissions to preach are not from Jerusalem or from any witness of the resurrection, significant as that witness may be for the preservation of the tradition, but from God alone.¹⁰ So, having established his right to apostleship as defined by his opponents, he removes it as the basis of the preaching mission of the team, and establishes the team's rights as those who are also called and commissioned to serve. Thus in I Corinthians Paul is defending, not just himself, but his whole group. By amassing examples, he is establishing his own personal cause before the court of Christian opinion in Corinth, which court has, without proper evidence, prejudged his case and moved to reject him, and so also his colleagues.

In spite, however, of the fact that much of the personal nature of the letter may be understood as personal defence for the

sake of the team, one must still admit that there is a decisive change in regard to Paul's conception of his own position from that visible in I and II Thessalonians. It is now not so much "we commend you", but "I commend you" (11:2). Paul is the one who instructed them in the traditions of the Last Supper (11:23). Paul is the one who delivered the traditions to them (11:2). He is the one who suggests order in worship (14:26-33). Almost in contrast to II Cor. 2:14-7:4, where he notes the team's evangelization of Corinth, Paul writes in I Cor. 15:1-2, "Now I would remind you, brethren, in what terms I preached to you the gospel, which you received, in which you stand, by which you are saved". But of course, he is still defending the source of his gospel and his right to preach it (cf. 15:3-8); at the same time he humbly accepts the fact that their rebukes have some justification, for he acknowledges that, because he persecuted the church, he is the least of all the apostles. Nevertheless, that does not detract from his present right to preach nor from the validity of his preaching, for "by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace toward me was not in vain" (15:10). Indeed, in these statements Paul would seem to be granting, in the terms of his opponents' views of apostleship, that he has a peculiar position in relation to his co-workers.

In the conclusion of I Corinthians, Paul assumes the position of director of the church and of the team (16:1-12). Here, although he is again identified with his team workers ("he is doing the work of the Lord, as I am", v. 10b), yet there is a distinction between himself and his co-workers which is only barely to be detected in I and II Thessalonians, for here Paul leaves no room for doubt that he is the leader.

In the "severe letter", II Cor. 10-13, much the same

denunciation and defence appear as in I Corinthians, though greatly intensified; there is a similar personal approach, and the first person singular is predominantly, although not exclusively, employed, "I, Paul, myself entreat you, by the meekness and gentleness of Christ . . . I beg of you that when I am present I may not have to show boldness with such confidence as I count on showing" (10:1-2). Again in vv. 8-9 he brings himself into the foreground. Also in 11:1-12:13 he gives a long, personal testimony concerning the basis of his preaching, his methods of missionizing so as not to be a burden on anyone, and especially his qualifications, which, he implies, should be evidence enough for them to accept him as an apostle "not at all inferior to these superlative apostles, even though I am nothing" (II Cor. 12:11). Then he threatens to come to them the third time (12:14), when he will not spare them (13:2), and when indeed they may not find him what they wish (12:20). Since they, as he says, "desire proof that Christ is speaking in me" (13:3), he will give that proof, presumably in judgment, using the power of Christ to pronounce it (13:3-4, 10). It is a warning which Paul hopes will be heeded (13:5-9, 11).

As in I Corinthians, so here it may be inferred that this letter is in response to continued, indeed exacerbated, charges levelled against him. The "severe letter" is not only a personal defence, but an aggressive attack. The Corinthians are becoming much more brutal in their thrusts, for "I who am humble when face to face with you, but bold to you when I am away" (10:1) is a statement that Paul would not be repeating, if they had not already cast it at him. The rallying cry of many Corinthians in I Cor. 1:12, "I belong to Christ", has by this time probably become stronger, with Judaizing Christians joining forces with other opposing parties in

the clamour against him. As earlier in I Corinthians (cf. 1:13), so now Paul does not deny that his opponents may belong to Christ, but he indicates in his argument that these particular people are saying that he and his colleagues do not belong to Christ. Paul's rebuttal is of special interest, "If anyone is confident that he is Christ's, let him remind himself that as he is Christ's, so are we" (II Cor. 10:7). The "we" in this verse refers back to the first person plural in 10:3-6, not to the singulars in vv. 1-2, i.e., it is a description of the team's ministry.

Paul uses the first person singular in 10:1-2, and in vv. 8-9 only because this is the vein in which his opponents force him to carry on his defence. His reply to one of their taunts is noteworthy. He quotes them as saying, "His letters are weighty and strong, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech of no account" (v. 10). In his answer to them, however, he subtly corrects their wording by changing the singular to plural (v. 11; also 10:8; 11:6). Technically, the Corinthians may be right in assuming that the letters and teachings are Paul's, but according to him they are wrong in thinking that these letters and teachings represent only his thoughts, or that they should even be considered as primarily from him. His letters are communications from the team. In this way he reminds the Greek Corinthians that Christians must think semitically in this respect and not hellenistically. They must think of him as one of the team, and not of each member of the team as well as of himself as individuals acting independently, even as he insists they must think of their own membership in the church itself.

When Paul refers to his own personal experiences in order to establish the validity of his and his team's mission, he uses the

singular "I" and not "we", e.g., II Cor. 11, especially vv. 22-25; and 12:1-12. The Corinthians are accustomed to hearing skilled, sophist preachers who teach for pay (cf. 11:6-7). Now they are hearing false apostles who have come to Corinth and are doing the same thing, claiming their right to support on the basis of their superior qualifications. They accuse Paul of not having their skill. They note that he does not preach for pay. Therefore--so the Corinthians seem to be reasoning--there is something fraudulent about him. He cannot be a genuine apostle, and does not have the necessary prerequisites which the Judaizers boast that they have. Consequently, he has to recount his qualifications on the Judaizers' terms. He must use the singular pronoun "I". He must claim equality with them on purely Jewish Christian grounds. i.e., from being a descendant of Abraham right through his own sufferings for the cause, which he demonstrates to be far greater than those of any of his rivals. He adds boast to boast (11:16-12:12), only because, as he says, "You forced me to it" (12:11). Then after this long passage, he returns to speak in terms of the group's solidarity with him (12:19)--the first person plural in v. 19b refers back to the "we" in v. 18 and by implication includes any others considered to be in the group, for there Titus and Paul are both acting corporately. Finally, after his threat to come personally to punish the Corinthians (13:1-4, but note his change of pronouns in 4b), he closes the section with the group's prayer for the local church (13:7-9), which concludes with, "What we pray for is your improvement." At the point where the Corinthian opponents fragmentize the church and the team by singling out Paul for attack, he, in his defence, rebuilds the structure of team solidarity and of church unity. He re-establishes the basis and form of his ecumenism, the

object of his mission.

In Paul's next letter (II Cor. 1:3-2:13; 7:5-16), the same trend is exhibited as in I Corinthians and II Corinthians 10-13, that is, the "I" comes in occasionally, e.g., "I hope you will understand fully" (1:13). But this may be just Paul expressing a personal wish in what is otherwise a group desire, for he continues, "that you can be proud of us as we can be of you, on the day of the Lord Jesus." Then in the following verses, 15-17, he uses "I" again in explaining the change in his plans. This is explicable as a reference, not of course to the whole team's coming, but to his own personal visit and so to his own change of plans, even though he still comes as a representative of those who originally preached amongst them (1:19). So also it is natural for him to explain his reasons for changing his itinerary (1:23-2:4).

Paul's function in the group, however, is apparent. In II Cor. 1:23-2:4 and 2:9-11 he is still writing about his confrontation with the opposition in the Corinthian church and is continuing on that personal note, although now joyfully because of its happy conclusion. Yet one perceives that in this passage Paul definitely projects himself as the dominant figure of his missionary group. Furthermore, he is clearly the overseer of his churches. Nevertheless, in this relationship there is solidarity not only between Paul and the church, but also between its members, "But if any one has caused pain, he has caused it not to me, but in some measure . . . to you all" (2:5). Forgiveness restores the wholeness of the group (2:10-11; cf. 2:3c), not just the full membership of the penitent opponent (2:6-8).¹¹ The unity of the missionary team in all this is perceived in 1:24, "Not that we lord it over your faith; we work with you for your joy, for you stand firm in your faith." The last

part of this letter is a personal note. Titus, who rejoices at the good results of his visit, has given Paul the glad news of the Corinthians' good response to his "severe letter". So though the team must be understood as a corporate band (7:12-13), yet now admittedly Paul stands out as the leader of that group of which Titus and the brethren are presently members (7:14-16).¹²

II Cor. 8-9 continues the use of the singular pronoun. Paul himself reports about the contribution of the Thessalonians to the offering for the saints in Jerusalem, "they gave according to their means, as I can testify, and beyond their means" (8:3). He is the one who directs the churches of Achaia, "see that you excel in this gracious work also" (8:7), and continues, "I say this not as a command, but to prove by the earnestness of others that your love also is genuine" (8:8). He offers his own advice (8:10-15). Thus, the tone appears to be that of one who assumes that he alone is in command of the churches and of the workers. Therefore, when these passages are studied in isolation from the historical situations which produced them, it can seem as though Paul directs policy while others carry out his orders. It is interesting to observe, however, that now, after the Galatian-Corinthian rebellion, Paul attempts to conceal or to tone down his directives by making them sound like friendly suggestions kindly proffered.¹³ Though none of this attitude of command is obvious in I and II Thessalonians, yet it must be remembered that in II Cor. 8-9 these "I" passages occur in a letter (or postscript to a letter) which is strongly conscious of a team that acts corporately (cf. 8:1-6, 16-24).

Still to be considered in the corpus of Corinthian letters is II Cor. 2:14-7:4.¹⁴ But before its chronological sequence can be decided, it must first be examined for indications of the nature

of the relationship that existed between Paul and his fellow workers at the time that he wrote it.

One notices immediately the diametrically opposite temper in this letter compared with I Corinthians and the "severe letter". Not only is the mood mellow and entreating, rather than harsh and punitive, but its team consciousness is also more comparable to that in I and II Thessalonians than to that in I Corinthians and the rest of II Corinthians.

An occasional "I" is employed. The first is not until 5:11, "I hope it is known also to your conscience." This is just a parenthetical inclusion of his own personal hope, for his hope is really about "what we are", that is, Paul hopes that the Corinthians realize that they, he and his colleagues, are genuine and sincere missionaries of Christ. He closes this letter with one more personal note immediately after he has made a compassionate appeal, "Open your hearts to us; . . . I do not say this to condemn you, for I said before [but here Paul qualifies his personal reference with a statement that emphasizes his group consciousness, both of the team, and of the team as identified with the Corinthian congregation] that you are in our hearts, to die together and to live together" (7:2-3). The final verse is testimony to his own faith, pride, and joy in the Corinthians, while at the same time it closes the letter on the corporate note, "With all our affliction, I am overjoyed" (7:4).

From the evidence of the letters, it may be claimed that there is a measurable degree of development discernible in Paul's attitude in relation to his team, and to himself as a member of it, which corresponds with the chronological sequence of events and of letters suggested, the exception is II Cor. 2:14-7:4. Therefore, it is necessary to turn again to this letter for a closer examination,

and for comparison with the other letters that have been reviewed.

Some of its problems seem to be identical with those in I Corinthians, so that some scholars are led to assume that it continues the discussion begun in I Corinthians, but in response to the news that the trouble in Corinth is more serious than Paul was aware of when he wrote I Corinthians. If that is the case, then in such a situation one would have to suppose that he is calmer and is writing in a less egocentric manner. This would hardly accord with Paul's way of facing concrete situations, and it would be difficult to understand his reversion to such a violent attitude as that demonstrated in the letter which would then follow, i.e., II Cor. 10-13. If he had received worse news after dispatching the final communication contained in I Corinthians, then instead of sending a letter which does not fit the tense situation, such news would more likely have precipitated the immediate visit to Corinth where he could deal directly with the offenders.¹⁵ And this is what he evidently did, only to discover that his opponents could rally their forces too. When he arrived back in Ephesus after that fiasco, it was anything but a conciliatory letter that came from his hand; it was rather a more threatening and boastful letter than before, designed for the defence of his apostleship and the unity of his team.

If the above is a feasible reconstruction of events, then II Cor. 2:14-7:4 does not seem to fit the picture, and does not belong here. Yet, at the same time, this passage must be treated as a separate letter for the reasons which scholars have suggested, and for the additional stylistic reason which this examination is suggesting. It is known that Paul wrote at least one other letter (cf. I Cor. 5:9). And there is nothing to preclude other letters having been written than the one referred to there. Nor is there

any reason to suppose that the person or persons who compiled the Pauline corpus arranged the letters in chronological order.¹⁶ There is no external or intrinsic reason that forces one to place this section later than I Corinthians just because it is now contained in the canonical II Corinthians. It may be suggested that II Cor. 2:14-7:4, including or excluding 6:14-7:1, belongs to a period prior to I Corinthians. Indeed, it may be that it should be placed considerably earlier, even before (perhaps long before) Paul went to Jerusalem to confer with those "of repute".¹⁷ If so, this letter could have been written early in Paul's Ephesian residence and could give us evidence of the problem that was emerging even then in the Gentile mission field, which forced him to assume a more prominent position than before in relation to his co-workers, and which finally caused him to go back to Jerusalem.

The visit to Jerusalem and the results gained in conference with James, Cephas, and John seem to give Paul courage to deal directly and in forthright manner with the problems, as has been noted in I Corinthians and II Corinthians 10-13, culminating in the successful results evidenced in II Cor. 1:3-2:13; 7:5-16; and chs. 8 and 9. Also, the definite change in Paul's self-conscious attitude towards his function in the group is openly expressed in I and II Corinthians (except for II Cor. 2:14-7:4) and reflects the recognition reached in Jerusalem that he and Barnabas are apostles to the Gentiles as Peter is to the Jews. At any rate, II Cor. 2:14-7:4 seems to reveal the first signs of trouble encroaching upon Paul's territory at a time when he is, of course, the dominant spokesman for his team of fellow workers, but when he is still, as in Thessalonians, more submerged in the corporate entity of his group, and before the experiences leading up to and at the Jerusalem meeting

had caused him to emphasize his peculiar function in that entity.

Consequently, it might reasonably be assumed that this Jerusalem meeting was a significant turning point in Paul's thinking about his own relationship to the team and to his churches, which changed Paul from being merely the dominant mind in the work that he and his fellow workers had been carrying on in the East, to his being the recognized leader of the corporate missionary group with whom he worked. In the addresses of I and II Thessalonians (his first extant letters) and Philippians (his last letter), Paul does not distinguish himself as an apostle. In the other letters it is interesting to note the way in which he phrases the address concerning his apostleship in respect of the points in question in the text of the letters, which may mean that it is only because of the increasing questioning of his gospel and of his authority that he is forced not only to state his apostleship but also to make clear the authority behind his gospel as against opposing ones, cf. Gal. 1:1; Rom. 1:1-6. It may now be noted after this examination of the "I" and "we" passages that instead of the "we" passages meaning "I", as is generally thought, it is truer to say that, if anything, the "I" passages, in typically Hebraic fashion, always have in mind, indeed even openly imply, the totality and solidarity of the group to which the "I" belongs.

Paul and a Co-operative Mission to the Gentiles

It was noted above that for some reason Paul, Timothy, Prisca, and Aquila moved out of Achaia and took up residence in Ephesus. The presence of Prisca and Aquila with Paul in Achaia and in Ephesus suggests that one of the motivations for their move to Asia was economic, i.e., business, which may itself have been

closely connected with Paul's desire to pursue his mission successfully.¹⁸ It was also noted that apparently Paul himself did not travel extensively between his area churches. In addition, inasmuch as Paul would not allow his churches to provide the sustenance of his team, it may have been necessary for him to help finance his workers, especially when they had to travel extensively in order to nurture and to consolidate the young churches and to bind them successfully as a unit with Jerusalem by an offering which they helped to promote and to gather. Even so, he surely did more than make leather tents or weave at the loom while his fellow workers were on active missionary work which he and his trade partners may have helped to organize and to finance. There is evidence that suggests that he entered into co-operative relationship with other Gentile missions. This must now be examined.

In the only fragmentary letter of I and II Corinthians that might possibly originate within the earlier period of Paul's ministry, i.e., II Cor. 2:14-7:4, there is no indication of any activity other than his continued interest in his Corinthian church which he has left behind; but in I Cor. 1:11-12, written after his return to Ephesus from Jerusalem, Paul says,

For it has been reported to me by Chloe's people that there is quarrelling among you, my brethren. What I mean is that each one of you says, "I belong to Paul," or "I belong to Apollos," or "I belong to Cephas," or "I belong to Christ."

It is clear that Paul had no quarrel with Apollos, nor indeed with Cephas. In fact, Paul uses Apollos and himself as examples of missionary workers and of what they are trying to accomplish. He evidently feels that he can do this, because he knows that the readers are aware that he and Apollos are working together (cf. I Cor. 16:12).

According to Paul, Apollos is a missionary with whom he is working, who has entered his field not as an opponent but as one who continues to teach the gospel, probably at Paul's request, some time before or as Paul sets out for his second visit to Jerusalem, which, if this chronology is correct, would be the only logical time. And probably innocently enough Apollos does so in such eloquent terms that the contrast does not help Paul's reputation or strengthen his position as founding father of that area. Not to deflate Apollos' eloquence but rather to counter these cliques, Paul shows the Corinthians the important matter which they failed to look for in the ones around whom they gravitated.

In I Cor. 3:5-9, Paul asks the Corinthians to consider the structure of the church's missionary programme. First he reminds them of their basic orientation to God who alone gives meaning and assurance to the whole venture of salvation. Then he affirms the principle which he has been taking for granted in his team relationships, "He who plants and he who waters are equal, and each shall receive his wages according to his labour." Though in this particular text Paul may not be conferring upon Apollos the appellation of apostle,¹⁹ yet that does not disturb the essential equality of each working member of the missionary team or teams. The humbler in function is equal to the more comely. Thus, equality is based in the social solidarity of the group, the oneness realized in corporate being, and is not to be equated with one's function within the group. God alone rewards, not on the basis of status, but, as one must assume from this passage, upon the basis of the expected output that is in keeping with the calling of the labourer (cf. II Cor. 5:9-10; also Mt. 20:1-16). Paul then underlines the meaning of this equality, "For we are God's fellow workers". As such the further

implication of course is that the field in which the team is working is a united whole, for it is "God's field, God's building" (I Cor. 3:9). The building of God is not a jumble, and the field is the property of a single owner and is not divided. Thus the Corinthians as Christians are also each equal parts of a great ecumenical project which is God's.

Paul continues with the figure. "According to the grace of God given to me, like a skilled master builder I laid a foundation, and another man is building upon it" (3:10), where it is assumed that this other man is also following the directive which he, too, received from God who directs the project, i.e., that he too is fully commissioned by God to do the work (cf. I Cor. 1:21; 3:5, 9). Thus there is a division of labour, but that does not stratify the labourers, for they are "equal" (ὁ φύτεύων δὲ καὶ ὁ ποτίζων ἓν ἔσιν v. 8a).²⁰ The same team (θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν συνεργοί v. 9a) carries out the work (3:8-10). To this extent, therefore, Apollos is in Paul's team.²¹

Indeed, as is frequently pointed out by scholars, Paul and Apollos are colleagues in the work of Christ. With the evidence that is available, one may go further and assume that Paul and Apollos view themselves as partners in a common work in the missionary field of Achaia; they are not rivals, but associates in a team where the work is planned and executed in agreement. References to "brethren" (discussed from a different point of view in the previous chapter) in I and II Corinthians may help to disclose the nature of Paul's activity in relation to Apollos during Paul's Ephesian residence. Two distinct references to "brethren" are contained in I Cor. 16:11, 12. The first is in connection with Timothy (cf. 4:17 and 16:10-11). The other follows in Paul's next sentence in connec-

tion with the hoped for visit of Apollos to the Corinthians. Apollos was urged to go along with the "brethren". This could mean, (1) with those who accompanied Timothy who had already gone on, or (2) another group of workers going to Corinth. The latter would seem unlikely. The reference follows directly upon instructions about Timothy.²² Although at this time Apollos does not will to go, yet both the urging by Paul and the declaration by Apollos imply mutual discussion and weighing of the total situation before arriving at a decision, and so there is reason to see him as being in some way considered as a member of Paul's team. For surely the unnamed brethren are regarded as such at this time.

In the "severe letter", II Cor. 10-13, Paul refers to some previous team visit in which he endeavoured through Titus to make things right in Corinth. With Titus he "sent the brother" (12:18), undoubtedly another person who is a co-worker.

I and II Corinthians were orientated in Ephesus, that is, according to the sequence suggested in this study, II Cor. 2:14-7:4, I Corinthians and II Corinthians 10-13 were written from Ephesus, and II Cor. 1:3-2:13; 7:5-16; 8; 9, though sent from Macedonia, was composed while Paul and the brethren were en route from Ephesus to Corinth. In other words, Titus, Timothy, the brethren who have been sent at any time with either of the former, the brethren presently with Paul in Macedonia (if different from the others), and Apollos all have Ephesus-Asia as their base of operations.

So it appears that Paul was actively at work in Asia in co-operation with these men, especially with Apollos. Therefore, he himself is feasibly working in this Asian theatre as one identified with some team or teams. For if he were trespassing on Apollos' territory as others not belonging to his group were on his own,

their relationship would hardly have been as congenial as it appears to be. And as Paul insists, they are all equals, all co-workers, all fellow servants, all brothers, all commissioned by the Lord.

In the Corinthian correspondence Ephesus emerges as the centre from which Paul's extensive missionary field radiates, at least in a westerly direction. As with Timothy's circuit by way of Macedonia begun immediately after Paul had arrived back in Ephesus from Jerusalem, so Paul's final tour to Macedonia originated in Ephesus, and seems to have had as its purpose a visit to Achaia by way of a circuitous tour of the Macedonian-Achaian churches. He took with him brothers normally associated with the Asian churches that lie in the eastern half of what may now be tentatively called Paul's total missionary territory. One of these brothers was appointed by these eastern churches to assist him with the offering (II Cor. 8:19).²³ When they arrived in Macedonia, Titus, also working from Ephesus but orientated towards Corinth, joined them. In view of this evidence one might suggest that Titus was now specializing in Achaia, that Timothy was covering the vast Macedonian province "as far as Illyricum" (which may be one reason why Timothy possibly did not have time to go to Achaia before returning to Ephesus where Paul expected him), and that Paul was using Ephesus as a base from which to direct the comprehensive missionary programme of all this extensive missionary field.

Treatment of Colossians and Philemon has purposely been deferred. For reasons already discussed in chapter two (pp. 52-55), it is assumed here that both Colossians and Philemon, which portray similar circumstances and background, were written in approximately the same period of Paul's Ephesian ministry, somewhere between his first arrival in Ephesus after leaving Corinth and his departure for

Jerusalem "after fourteen years".

Paul includes in the addresses of both these letters his faithful helper, Timothy, who alone seems to have been with him throughout his entire ministry. Though in the Thessalonian and Corinthian correspondence it has been noted that Timothy's work lay primarily in tending the churches to the west, i.e., in Macedonia and Achaia, nevertheless, the fact that he is included in these addresses indicates that he is also known to Philemon, to the Colossians, and by inference, to the Laodiceans. Therefore, to this extent, as has been observed of Paul's practice in letters written to his own western churches, so here his use of the first person plural may at least include Timothy as one of those who, with Paul, is related in some way to these eastern churches. In these letters it seems that Paul is again identifying himself with a corporate group or team, in this case with the workers who share the Asian field,²⁴ even though in the letter to Philemon, which by its very nature is personal, Paul writes, except for the address (1b, 2), entirely in his own name.

The area to which both Colossians and Philemon are sent is the Lycus valley. Paul is not the missionary who evangelized the region but Epaphras (Col. 1:6b-7a). Furthermore, to judge from Colossians (cf. e.g., 1:7-8; 2:1-5; 4:12-13), Epaphras must have either expected Paul's counsel or asked for his help with the problems that had arisen in the field, and Paul, by sending that letter, obliges. Thus in this new area there emerges a team pattern between Paul and, not only Timothy, but Epaphras, for Epaphras is a "beloved fellow servant", literally, fellow slave, *συνδούλου* (1:7, cf. 4:7).²⁵ The next clause as read in p⁴⁶ *Λ*ABD*OG* pm (so RSV), makes this relationship clear, "He is a faithful minister of Christ

on our behalf", where, not understanding this team relationship, a scribe erroneously decided ἡμῶν to be a mistake and so gave it a more natural rendering, ὑμῶν, i.e., "on your behalf" (so CKLP al lat sy^s; AV). But the harder reading is the more likely and refers back not to Paul alone, but to the team working in this eastern area, i.e., to the ἡμῶν of v. 7a, to which he reports, and which are the ἡμῶν in v. 8a. In 4:12-13 there is the implication in the praise that Paul bestows upon Epaphras that the Colossians, because of Epaphras' zeal and hard work for them, should recognize these outstanding qualities in their minister. In this can be noted the tacit approval given to Epaphras, not only by Paul, but by Paul as spokesman for the team (cf. 1:7-8; 4:7-11), which in turn implies that Epaphras is considered by his colleagues as a worthy member of their corporate association. Thus it seems that both Paul and Epaphras are identified with the same missionary team that acts corporately in relation to these eastern churches, just as the group which is concerned with the western part of this comprehensive region acts corporately in relation to theirs. In these letters Timothy, as one member of the western team, is also connected by Paul with the group working in this eastern area. Whether he ever actually worked in the area one cannot say, except that the presence of his name in the addresses appears to indicate that he did; otherwise it hardly seems possible that the recipients would have known him, and the inclusion of his name would be pointless.

The attitude of the churches in the Lycus valley, especially at Colossae, reflected in Colossians towards Paul tends to bear out the assumption that there is a team relationship between these churches and the several fellow workers named in the letter. The congregation has a genuine interest and concern about the team, for

although Paul had not been immediately involved in converting and teaching this church and is evidently not known to them by sight (2:1), yet the fact that Epaphras makes "known to us your love in the Spirit" (1:8), indicates that Paul is included and that the "us" refers not to Paul alone, but to the whole group working together as a unit in the area. Paul accepts this concern about himself and his fellow workers as something quite expected and natural in the situation, and he underlines this expression of community solidarity by reassuring the congregation that on his part the feeling is mutual (2:1, 5). Likewise, Paul expressly sends Tychicus to them to relieve their anxiety about the group which includes himself (4:7-9).

Throughout Colossians Paul assumes that this close relationship of all his fellow workers exists, just as he does in his western letters. So, members of this eastern missionary team preach and exhort in concord as though by common consent and as organizationally united for the single purpose of presenting the converts "mature in Christ" (1:28-29, cf. Rom. 15:16-17), undoubtedly the eschatological goal of all their activity. Paul's feeling of corporate identity with his fellow workers in this eastern sector is also evident in such interchanges of pronouns as seen in 4:3-4, "and pray for us also, that God may open to us a door for the word, to declare the mystery of Christ, on account of which I am in prison, that I may make it clear, as I ought to speak." The prayer for his fellow workers is a prayer for himself, and vice versa.

So far, except for Paul and Timothy, only Epaphras and Tychicus have been cited as genuine, working members of this eastern team. But there are others known to these Asian churches whom Paul names as his fellow workers. Such are "Aristarchus my fellow prisoner", and also "Jesus who is called Justus", and Mark (who will

be omitted from this discussion for the present). These are Jewish Christian members of the group (4:10-11). In such instances the phrase "my fellow workers" implies no hierarchical stratification. Paul is merely associating himself with them in the common programme of area evangelization as one of them.

Two others, this time non-Jewish Christians, are also included in Colossians, namely, "Luke the beloved physician and Demas" (4:14). They are merely mentioned in the greetings. In his personal letter to Philemon, Paul again includes Luke and Demas in the greeting along with Aristarchus and Mark who, in Colossians, are grouped with the Jewish Christians; but in Philemon Paul describes these four people as, "my fellow workers" (vv. 23-24).

One other name must be mentioned as occurring in both these letters, namely, Archippus. In Colossians, Paul gives a friendly prod to him through the congregation, "'See that you fulfil the ministry which you have received in the Lord'" (4:17). In Philemon, he is called "our fellow soldier" (v.2).

Nevertheless, regardless of Paul's close comradeship with all these fellow workers in Christ, indeed identification with them in the work of propagating the gospel in these Asian cities, and even though he writes to these congregations and to one of its influential members whom he also called a fellow worker (Phlm. 1b), it should be noted that up to this time Paul himself has not personally visited or worked amongst them. A further observation may be made here. Apart from Timothy, these people who have been mentioned by name in these letters are not mentioned in any extant communication of Paul to his western churches, those he established in Macedonia and Achaia; and except for Timothy, none that are known to be from the west are included in these extant letters to the eastern side of

this combined missionary field.²⁶ One of these people mentioned in Colossians and Philemon could of course be the famous preacher, and perhaps another the tested brother mentioned in II Cor. 8, and yet another the brother sent with Titus to Corinth; but there is no basis for such identifications. Many unnamed Christians could have been charismatic workers ready to give assistance where needed, cf. I Cor. 16:15-16. There is, however, indication that the team organization which was apparent in Paul's activity while he resided in Achaia and Macedonia continues on a broader scale in the work he does from Ephesus. Indeed it now seems that after moving to Ephesus, Paul's own Achaian-Macedonian team becomes linked with another (or others) which possibly was already working in Asia, and that now the two (or more) are co-operating in a more extensive field.

One of the basic principles, already discussed, which determined the place and, where applicable, the nature of Paul's missionary activity was never to work in another man's territory. Yet in Colossians he writes to a church that he had neither seen nor founded, "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, . . . I became a minister according to the divine office which was given to me for you" (1:24-25). Again, he writes, "For I want you to know how greatly I strive for you, and for those at Laodicea, and for all who have not seen my face" (2:1), and, "For though I am absent in body, yet I am with you in spirit, rejoicing to see your good order and the firmness of your faith in Christ" (2:5). These certainly are the words of one who felt that he was looked upon by those respective churches as a key figure in the missionary team that was responsible for the work done in them, and so in eastern Asia. The question may also be asked why Epaphras should have singled out Paul

as the one to whom he should report the activities in his churches, if he, too, did not regard Paul in this light, even though he himself may have been considered another equal and indeed was called a fellow servant? Although Paul was "absent in body", he nevertheless had these churches very much on his mind and diligently strove for them in some way. He then proceeds with exhortation, surely bold for one who had never seen them, unless he himself felt that he was considered by them and by the team as a key member of the group responsible for this area. So Paul issues directives (4:16), and admonishes (possibly only in encouragement) a team member working in that area (4:17), and evidently assumed that his commendation of Epaphras (4:13) would not be ill considered. Finally, in a personal touch of affection, he wrote his own greeting with his "own hand" (v. 18).

Paul's letter to Philemon is of course a very personal one,²⁷ but in it one perceives that he has unusually powerful influence (cf. e.g., v. 8) over a wealthy person in Asia. Yet Paul exerts that personal influence as one of a group (vv. 23-24) to which Philemon also in some way belongs (v. 1b).

Nevertheless, much of this activity that has been noted in Colossians and Philemon, at least that part that takes place in Ephesus, occurs in what is possibly Apollos' territory. So Paul is apparently working in Apollos' field. Evidence which may throw light upon this situation is found in I Corinthians in the passage where Apollos is said to be working in Paul's field. In his contention with the Corinthians over false allegiances Paul does not oppose Apollos. Yet on the other hand, he bitterly opposes others who come into Achaia--a territory that definitely is not theirs but one where Paul has laid the foundation, upon which Apollos, as a

co-operative worker, has built. The false apostles, however, are competitors who attempt to lay foundations other than the one that Paul has laid. Thus, they not only are from outside the area altogether but also represent an entirely different rendering of the gospel. As has been suggested, they are probably Judaizing Jewish Christians from Palestine or from Jerusalem itself. Apollos, however, is clearly in a different category. He is one of Paul's team. It seems possible therefore to conjecture from the internal evidence of Colossians and Philemon, that a reciprocal arrangement was made between the Asian missionaries, including Apollos, and Paul, however tacitly it may have been arrived at. That is, Paul helped Apollos and the Asian missionaries and their teams, who worked in the Asian territory, when they and their team evidently turned to Paul for his counsel and help, just as Paul undoubtedly turned to Apollos and to several on the Asian team (known to us in the Corinthian correspondence merely as "brethren") for their help. So Epaphras came to Paul for aid (Col. 1:8), and Colossians is the result of that request.²⁸ This arrangement may account for the comparative silence of Paul as far as Ephesus and other eastern areas (excepting northern Galatia) are concerned. These fields belonged to others.

Apollos, however, is not mentioned in either Colossians or Philemon. The solution of the problem seems to be that many missionaries worked smaller areas than apparently Barnabas and surely Paul did. If Apollos was restricted to Asia to the west, i.e., to Ephesus and environs for an unknown distance outwards, and the Lycus valley was the sphere of Epaphras and the workers whom Paul notes in that area, then it is explained why Apollos' name is not mentioned in either letter. Yet Apollos would be included, and perhaps many more "brothers", in the now much larger corporate group of combined

teams that we are now discussing.

Nevertheless, Paul himself seems to have been the great mind steering the activities and thoughts of all these teams and of any combinations of them, as Colossians, Philemon, and Apollos' co-operation in Achaia indicate. Thus Paul may have moved from Achaia to Ephesus partly for economic reasons, but an invitation from Christian workers in Ephesus, "Come over and help us in Asia", may well have provided Paul and his partners (evangelical and business partners) with the favourable occasion that they needed. This indeed seems likely to have been the case, since there is so much co-operation existing between Paul and Apollos, Epaphras, and the brethren. Apollos and his co-workers may have recognized Paul's dominant personality, learning, ability in leadership, and an apostleship based upon his having seen the Lord, and decided, for the good of the whole mission, to invite him to participate in their area. Of course, the economic conditions offered by Ephesus may have held distinct advantages for Paul and his partners over either Achaia or Macedonia as a centre from which to work. Inasmuch as Achaia was an economically stricken land, and since Paul had suffered financially there, it is even possible that Apollos (who may already have visited Corinth, at which time he had realized the seriousness of Paul's, Prisca's, and Aquila's economic difficulties), having perceived the great advantages for both parties to work together, had urged them to come and to make Ephesus their headquarters for more profitable labour at their trade and for missionary work with the combined teams, and for Paul to counsel them and to superintend his own operations (and in some way theirs) from that city which was so central for the united areas.²⁹

Concerning the place of Colossians and Philemon in the

chronology of Paul's life and letters, inasmuch as a sense of corporate action is strongly present, and since Paul's personal influence within these eastern missionary teams and Asian churches is expressed with reserve, the two letters seem to represent a stage of development that is intermediary between the style of I and II Thessalonians, in which the self is almost totally submerged in a corporate solidarity, and the very pronounced, self-conscious assumption of dominance within the team structure that is pictured in the Corinthian correspondence (except for II Cor. 2:14-7:4). Since the great change, not necessarily in Paul's psychology but in the self-assertive stand which hostile, external pressures were forcing him to take in his letters, seems to have occurred as a result of the Jerusalem conference when Paul and Barnabas were recognized by the leaders of the church in Jerusalem as apostles to the Gentiles, it seems logical to assign these letters to the pre-Jerusalem, Ephesian period. Also, the fact that there is in them no reference to or intimation of the result of the Jerusalem meeting, especially in respect of the offering, is an additional reason for supposing that the letters should be placed before that visit.

If that should be the case, and the above historical situation and relationships be correct, then Col. 4:10 may have significance. For in Col. 4:10 one reads of a series of people who send greetings to the Colossians, presumably people who are with Paul. Amongst these in the list is "Mark the cousin of Barnabas". Scholars presume that the instructions concerning him which follow his name are disparaging, but the censoriousness is read into the passage from the account in Acts 15:36-41 and according to its chronology of the parting of Paul and Barnabas. In that case, however, it is difficult to understand how Mark, who, according to Acts

is a worker with Barnabas, could be with Paul anyway, and is now called a fellow worker. But if, as in our chronology, Colossians comes from Paul's pre-Jerusalem Ephesian period, then this reference may provide an important link with later occurrences.

Apart from this oblique reference in Colossians, it is not until Gal. 2 and I Cor. 9 that Paul says anything about Barnabas. In Gal. 2:1 Paul declares, "Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas". Though he says nothing about Barnabas in the experiences that he recounts in Gal. 1, which are previous to this Jerusalem meeting, he obviously knew him in some significant way if only because he joined Barnabas on this journey to Jerusalem. In this regard it should be noted that according to I Cor. 9 (cf. v. 6), Paul is cognizant that Barnabas' policies and field organization are much the same as his own, as though they had been previously agreed upon. And it should be observed that the weakness portrayed by Barnabas at Antioch after the Jerusalem meeting does not seem to separate the two or alter their close association, since this passage is written after that event.³⁰ Therefore, since I Cor. 9 and Gal. 2 convey the impression that a close relationship exists between Paul and Barnabas, and since both Paul and Barnabas received from the Jerusalem leaders the right hand of fellowship and the acknowledgment that they are apostles to the Gentiles, and seeing that Barnabas is nevertheless not mentioned in any of Paul's extant letters as working with him in his field, it seems reasonable to conjecture that Paul and Barnabas conjointly planned their strategy, i.e., the nature of their mission, their field organization, and their territorial divisions--thus assuring greater coverage in a given time--at the very beginning of their careers. Also at that time they both conceivably came to a general

agreement on the principles that should govern their methods, i.e., concerning working for a living, and about not missionizing in other people's territories.

First, they must not be like travelling Gentile sophists, but must labour for their livelihood. Such may be inferred from I Cor. 9:1-18.³¹ In this argument Paul speaks not only for his immediate team but also for the apostle with whom he works as a close colleague, namely, Barnabas. That is the significance of the first person plural in the question which he poses, "Do we not have the right . . . , as the other apostles . . . ?" What Paul is claiming here for himself, he is also claiming for Barnabas. Since, however, this principle of action appears as a major topic in I Thessalonians, Paul's first letter, written to one of his first churches in his first mission area, it must have been decided upon as a principle of missionary method long before he arrived in Macedonia.

Second, Paul and Barnabas evidently jointly decided not to labour in another man's territory. For inasmuch as there appears to be some kind of partnership between them, it is reasonable to suppose that it was Barnabas' maxim as well as Paul's. Since both Paul and Barnabas went together to Jerusalem for the same purpose, and since Paul gives no indication in his references to Barnabas that either group of workers trespassed on the other's domain in any way as rivals, and because there seems to be friendly communication between them, it would appear that they mutually decided upon this policy, because their eschatological views were the same. In that case, it stands to reason that, because of the urgency of the times, they might hope to obtain the "full number of the Gentiles" (Rom. 11:25) more quickly if there was co-operation between apostles, than if there was unnecessary duplication of mission fields.³²

The reference to Mark in Col. 4:10, therefore, may obliquely indicate that Barnabas is somewhere about. It seems more likely that during the past fourteen years Mark was not associated with Paul or Apollos, but with Barnabas. Yet Mark is mentioned as Paul's fellow worker (Phlm. 24), and furthermore he is included as such in both Colossians and Philemon. Though Colossians and Philemon may have been written at about the same time, there is some indication that an indefinite period of time may have elapsed between the writing of Philemon and the sending of Colossians. If it could be true that Paul is working with Apollos and the Asian missionaries, then there is nothing to prevent a partnership existing also with Barnabas, still without overlap in areas where each was immediately and directly concerned. This appears to have been the case, inasmuch as Mark is introduced to the Colossians as Barnabas' cousin, so connecting Mark with a person evidently well known to them. Also, one should not necessarily associate Mark directly with the Asian theatre of missionary activity just because Paul calls him a fellow worker, since Paul has to introduce him so explicitly to important churches in the area. If he belonged to Asia, these churches would have known him, as they seemingly do the others. Yet if he is a member of a neighbouring apostle's team with which Paul feels closely associated, then the appellation, "fellow worker", is still understandable, and Asians would not necessarily know him. If so, then one could expect that some communication or crossing over and sharing of helpers took place at various times between Paul and Barnabas, just as evidently occurred between Paul, Apollos, and the Asian missionaries. In this way a mutual identification of team members would be effected. Thus Paul would quite naturally think of them--and so here, of Mark--as fellow workers even though they were

not of his immediate group. At the same time, he could use them, and he may have used Mark.³³

If this interpretation of these bits of evidence should be correct, then it may be possible that Mark had come on a mission from Barnabas to Paul with news about Judaizing problems splitting the churches in Barnabas' field farther east, an intimation that is visible in Col. 4:10. If the above reconstruction of the developing situation is plausible, then the trouble that Paul is experiencing in Corinth and Ephesus may be one that all the Pauline-type apostles to the Gentiles are sharing.

Whether it was Barnabas or Paul who suggested the journey to Jerusalem, is not known. If Mark is indeed working on Barnabas' team, then Barnabas may have sent him to Paul for a good reason, such as to seek Paul's co-operation in some critical matter. For according to the chronology suggested in this study, and Paul's intimations in Gal. 1-2, it appears that it was some such condition developing in the Gentile mission field as that caused by the interference of Palestinian Judaizers that was the source of Paul's revelation that he should go to Jerusalem, and that sent the two on their journey there. Earlier, either before Mark left Paul after the particular visit intimated by references to him in Colossians, or even slightly before that, if Mark had come on a previous mission to discuss the problem with him, Paul may have dispatched his letter to Philemon about Onesimus in which he not only mentions Mark's name in the greetings but also says, "prepare a guest room for me" (v. 22). In the light of the suggestions above, these two items of information noted in Philemon make it a possibility that Paul intended to visit Philemon while en route to join Barnabas for their journey to Jerusalem. At any rate, there are indications in Paul's pre-confer-

ence letters that the threat to Christian unity was becoming serious and that some plans were being formulated by Paul and Barnabas to cope with it.

In addition, Paul may have suggested to Mark that he should return to Barnabas by way of Colossae where he could expect a welcome, for Paul may have already fully explained to that congregation about the co-operative relationship existing between himself and Barnabas.³⁴ For the trouble causing the fragmentation of the churches was not coming from co-operating colleagues, but from apostles who were not respecting their standards or principles and who were not preaching the same gospel (cf. e.g., Col. 2:4-8; also, II Cor. 11:4; Gal. 1:6-9). Thus Paul may have warned the churches to be wary of such strangers; but in contrast, he informed these congregations that Mark was a comrade and so should be welcomed. This is offered here as a possible reinterpretation of Col. 4:10.

This reconstruction of events helps to explain the aura of importance that seems to be gathering about Paul to a greater extent in Colossians and Philemon than was noticeable in I and II Thessalonians and II Cor. 2:14-7:4. It is one that the evolving pattern of events seems to force upon him. His fellow workers in the respective teams as well as the co-operating neighbouring apostles, Apollos and Barnabas, probably because they recognize his abilities, press him into a position of leadership. This casual, informal action is strengthened by the discussions and decisions at Jerusalem. Though Paul accepts this responsibility, as the remainder of the Corinthian correspondence and Galatians indicate, yet it can be seen, by the way he constantly identifies himself with the team and reminds the church of the team's part in the mission, that the function given him was something thrust upon him.³⁵

One further condition should be noticed. Although Barnabas and Apollos may have recognized and availed themselves of Paul's mind by asking for his counsel and for his support in their struggle against Judaizers and false gospels, Paul nowhere accepts any superiority over either Barnabas or Apollos (cf. I Cor. 3:8; 9:6; Gal. 2:9).

Throughout his ministry, Paul recognized the full authority of "non-apostolic" missionaries to preach the gospel, and he respected their rights to their territories. Yet as circumstances changed under pressure from competing Judaizers, in order to protect his mission and his missioners and other missionaries preaching the same gospel who might turn to him for help, he was forced in practice to yield to the Judaizers' demands. So he established the authority of his gospel and of his apostleship by producing credentials from Christ, indeed, even by tracing his commission back to God himself. Perhaps in this way his field of operation was extended into Asia, and his influence reached as far as the eastern border of Barnabas' field.

CHAPTER VI

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

The Historical Background

Any attempt to discern from Paul's letters his understanding of his gospel of his missionary vocation and the manner in which he endeavoured to carry it out, will sooner or later come face to face with the problems set by the Epistle to the Romans. For, from any point of view, this letter presents acute problems concerning its origin. It is something of a standing paradox that the writing for which Paul has been chiefly known and influential as a theologian down the ages because it is the most systematic and consistently theological presentation of his thought, should have been written to a church with whose foundation he had not been connected, and which was personally unknown to him. For even if the fullest weight is given to his introduction of himself in chapters one and fifteen and to his explanation of his writing to them as those from whom he is to gain support for his mission, this hardly begins to account for the existence of the chapters of sustained theological and ethical exposition in between.

The majority of scholars, not unnaturally, have taken as their starting point the fact that the letter was written to the Roman church, and have attempted both to deduce from its shape and contents the characteristics of that church and its problems, and vice versa to interpret the text of Romans in the light of such supposed characteristics and problems. Of this approach the most

recent exponent is Paul S. Minear.¹ The difficulty of this view is that the argument is circular. Since the letter supposes conditions to exist against which Paul mounts his argument, therefore these were the conditions that naturally existed in Rome. But this remains hypothesis, and there is very little if any information from elsewhere about the church of Rome by which to check it. Furthermore, the hypothesis requires that Paul shall by this time know the supposed interior conditions and peculiar groupings as intimately as if it had been his own church, and this itself involves the much disputed question whether chapter 16, which could be used as evidence for such an intimate knowledge, is a part of the letter or was originally written to Rome. This approach also finds itself at times at a loss to provide a convincing background to some of what is said in Romans, while Minear's minute but hypothetical reconstruction of what is going on at Rome by means of the text of Romans may strike one at times as somewhat imaginary.

A different approach, of which Munck is the outstanding representative,² sees the writing of Romans as dictated less by the church of Rome and its supposed problems, than by the fact that Paul when he writes it has finished his task in the East, and that what he writes is, in Munck's terms, a manifesto addressed to the whole church, especially to that part he is leaving. Further, its contents are determined by the fact that as Paul sees it, Judaizing is now chronic in the sense, both that it permeates the whole church, and that it has been plaguing Paul throughout the many years of his Macedonian-Achaian-Ephesian ministry from the time that he had begun that ministry after the Jerusalem conference. On this view the matter was long and drawn out; the gathering of the offering extended over a long period of time; and the questions arising, though

harrassing to say the least, would not in themselves be such as to take him to Jerusalem.

This view, however, becomes less tenable if the chronology argued for in this thesis, and the reconstruction of Paul's outlook and activity based upon it, are accepted. For then the difficulties for Paul when he wrote Romans were not chronic but acute. They had not been critical over many years, but had seriously come to a head only since the Jerusalem conference, and were critical by the time Paul arrived for his winter sojourn in Corinth where he wrote Romans.³ For he knew that he had not decisively defeated the Judaizers by bringing temporary unity to the Corinthian church. The whole ecumenical question was at a crucial point. It was now at the place where Paul must decide upon open battle, a theological battle that had to be engaged at the Jewish centre of the church, Jerusalem,⁴ not just with the hard pressed "pillars" of the church who were in principle on Paul's side, but who were in a perilous position before the Jews and Judaizers (cf. Gal. 2:12b), but also with the whole church, including the leaders of the Palestinian Judaizers themselves. Paul must go back to Jerusalem and present the case for his ecumenical gospel. The offering in itself was important, but it was only the symbol of the issue. Fear that the offering might not be accepted (Rom. 15:31b) was fear that the conflict had become so serious that the ecumenical church might suffer, not that God's gospel would ever fail, or that the Gentile mission would thereby cease, but that Jewish Christianity itself would be rejected. One way or the other Paul expected to come to Rome (cf. 15:24, 28-29, 32); but he hoped (v. 32)--indeed, even was convinced (v. 29)--that his coming would be with joy because of the successful outcome of his mission to Jerusalem. It was in this situation that

it is conjectured here that the body of what we now know as the letter to the Romans was composed, i.e., not for the Roman congregation as such, but for this Jerusalem meeting.

Ernst Fuchs,⁵ recognizing from the nature of its contents that the historical background of the dispute with Jerusalem entered significantly into the writing of Romans, suggests that it was therefore secretly intended for Jerusalem. Marxsen⁶ rightly rejects this artifice. Nevertheless, while adhering to the traditional view that the canonical letter is a unity written for Rome, he observes, like Fuchs, that Paul's eyes were upon Jerusalem, where the background conditions for the argumentation in Romans prevailed. Yet by the same circular reasoning noted above, Marxsen reaffirms that these conditions also existed in Rome, and so like that traditional school suggests that Paul wrote this letter to Rome, and dealt with these supposedly identical problems as a preparatory exercise for his defence in Jerusalem. Bornkamm⁷ departs from the view of this school and that of Marxsen by rejecting the idea that the situation in Rome in any way gave rise to the letter. To this extent he agrees with Fuchs against Marxsen; but he goes on to argue that although Jerusalem is the background against which Paul writes Romans, the epistle itself reflects not the coming meeting and argumentation in Jerusalem but the situations which Paul had actually faced during his career. So for Bornkamm Romans is the story of Paul's missionary career in conflict with Jewish Christians, a contending with the religious, law-abiding Jew and to a lesser degree with the arrogant Gentile Christian wherever either may be found. To all intents, therefore, his understanding of Romans is a modified restatement of the widely held view that the epistle is Paul's testimonial (not theological treatise) which he composes, only primarily for Rome.

Recently, Jacob Jervell, working on the basis of Paul's own internal condition at the time of writing, and not just of his own circumstantial situation at that time, has arrived at a conclusion which in an important respect is like the one suggested here.⁸ The body of Romans, he says, is the contents of an address which Paul planned to deliver in Jerusalem. Jervell, however, goes on to explain that Paul put the contents of that speech into the body of Romans to inform the Roman church what he intends to say to the mother church in Jerusalem; and that he writes in this way to the Romans in order to win their solidarity and support for his undertaking. Like Bornkamm, but unlike Marxsen, Jervell rejects as wrong from the start any idea that the situation in Rome itself at all influenced the writing of, or is in any way reflected in, the body of Romans. Nevertheless all, including Jervell, are undoubtedly influenced by Acts in their approach to Paul, to his theology, and to his controversy with the Judaizers. For they all put Paul on the defensive in relation to his opponents, especially in relation to the apostles in Jerusalem, whom they presume Paul acknowledged as the ruling heads of the earthly church, and consequently by whom, they say, Paul knew he must ultimately be recognized and accepted if he was to save his mission from collapse.

It is suggested here that a modified form of Jervell's line of argument should be carried further, and that it should be based on an analysis not merely of Paul's own interior condition at the time of writing but of Paul's total personal situation as that is related to the overall historical situation out of which the writing of Romans arose; and moreover that this should be done apart from any reliance upon Acts. It is here suggested that if this approach is followed, it may be shown that Paul, rather than being on the

defensive, was on the offensive for the gospel and for the Gentile mission throughout his missionary career; and that at no time was this more so than when he wrote the body of Romans as his speech to be delivered at Jerusalem, the purpose of which was not to gain recognition and approval but to convert those Jewish Christians still unaware of the eschatological times in which they lived, and to embolden the Jewish Christian apostles (who were in agreement with Paul's views) to dare to live, and to missionize the whole world, according to the full implications of their gospel, and so to fulfil their God-given mission.⁹ Thus it is suggested that it was written for oral presentation in person to the first ecumenical council of the world church, requested by Paul himself on arrival at Jerusalem with the delegates of the Gentile portion of the church. Without this background of urgency, which is evident in this assessment of the chronology of events leading up to it, it is doubtful whether anything like Romans would ever have been written.

To say this, however, is not to deny that the literary composition that is now incorporated into the New Testament canon was sent to Rome. Nor can the questions involved in its possible numerous recensions and editions be discussed here.¹⁰ It is only contended here that Romans as an argument for Paul's gospel of ecumenism met an actual emergency centred in Jerusalem, and that this need not mean that it was primarily intended for Rome, if there are indications to the contrary.

Most commentators observe that Romans departs more from Paul's usual style of writing, and that it falls more into the category of a carefully planned theological treatise (except for the thanksgiving section, the doxologies, and the last chapters, which have a freer style and deal with more personal matters than

the rest of the epistle) than any other of his letters.¹¹ This suggests in its composition two distinct operations. The first is the careful preparation of the argument contained in the body of the letter, i.e., 1:16-15:13. The second is the addition of the remaining parts written in freer style, which may again themselves reflect two or three phases of composition: a) the adaptation of the address and salutation for more personal distribution; b) the more personalized explanations and plans presented to the particular church to which the extant letter was sent, i.e., 15:14-33; and perhaps c) the greetings with which the extant letter closes.

By whatever stages, Paul, however, did include the treatise with his personal letter, and he did send it to Rome. This might be held to be a strange thing to do. Can plausible reasons be suggested for his having done it, and for his having a writing in treatise form to send? It is possible to suggest that Paul committed his arguments on the ecumenism of his gospel to writing for the purpose of the Jerusalem meeting because he did not trust his ability to carry on oral argument. In II Cor. 10:10 Paul quotes a disparaging criticism of his technique, his presence, and his ability to carry on debate by word of mouth successfully. This criticism is implied in I Cor. 1:17; 2:1, 3-5 where Paul also intimates that he is conscious of this weakness (cf. Col. 4:4).¹² Nevertheless, as his letters bear out, and as his severest critics in II Cor. 10:10 acknowledge, Paul is powerful in the written word. Approximately six months prior to his composing the arguments in the body of Romans, both this weakness and this strength had had an occasion for demonstration. He had gone personally to Corinth to settle matters. Because of the reception he received there and his failure to achieve his purpose, it would have been far better if he had remained in

Ephesus. On the other hand, the sharp arguments in the letter which he addressed to them subsequently, of which II Cor. 10-13 is probably the main part, brought clarity into the muddled situation, a re-establishment of his authority, and at least temporary harmony.

Some commentators have pointed to the "oral" nature of Romans, meaning that it reads more like a speech, and have suggested that Paul composed it in Corinth while actually discussing the points of his argument with friends.¹³ This may indeed be how he went about composing the original draft with his Jerusalem audience in mind. Such careful preparation of a composition for oral presentation was not something without precedents, as extant senatorial and other orations of the classical world attest. The original document's argumentation would probably have been discussed and composed in Greek.¹⁴ How the speech was drafted is a technical consideration. That a Jerusalem copy did not survive is not a valid objection, for even letters of Paul have disappeared (cf. I Cor. 5:9; Col. 4:16). With the flight of Jewish Christians from Jerusalem about 67-68, and the fall of Jerusalem in 70, it could easily have been lost along with Jewish Christianity. But it does appear to be the prepared speech of an orator. For when writing to his own congregations, Paul uses the word γράφειν 24 times, and indicates that his writings are letters (ἐπιστολή, 14 times), and are to be read (ἀναγινώσκειν, 5 times); whereas it is notable that in the body of Romans (1:16-15:13) these terms are not found at all.¹⁵

Throughout the body of Romans Paul uses the forms both of the market-place and of the synagogue to develop his thesis. That which particularly stands out is his use of the diatribe, a form developed and used extensively by the cynics and stoics for propagating their philosophical ideas, which Paul himself would

undoubtedly have heard used in the market-places and which he likewise may have used when he preached there. It was the method by which the speaker, addressing his listeners directly in the second person singular (cf., e.g., ch. 2; 7:1-4; 9:19-20; 11:13-32; etc.), or including them in the first person plural (cf., e.g., 3:5-4:12; 6:1-15; etc.), and using a dialogue mode of questions and answers, proceeded to develop his argument by "wearing down" the objections that might be raised by the listener or the heckler as the thesis progressed. So Paul, posing the questions or objections which he presumes might be suggested to his audience by his preceding remarks, proceeds to answer these questions by continuing with more argumentation based upon these objections, which again leads to further questions, and so on--questions and answers, often cutting short imaginary hecklers with "replies which sometimes are withering and brusque".¹⁶ Within the diatribe Paul often uses the rabbinical form of text citation followed by comments to develop his argumentation, e.g., chs. 4 and 9-11. But his speech always moves toward the ultimate objective, the argument being successively raised to higher climactic plateaus, e.g., 3:19-20; 4:23-25; 5:18-21; 8:37-39; 11:32-36; 15:5-6, until the thesis (1:16-17) is completely expounded and the benediction (15:13), which concludes the exhortatory climax (15:7-12), is reached and the address is finished.

Romans as an Address for Jerusalem

How far may the structure of Rom. 1:16-15:13 be held to support the conjecture suggested by the external situation as reconstructed above that the document was written for oral presentation at Jerusalem for the purpose of persuading the gathered church that Paul's is the only workable and valid gospel for the total

church in this eschatological age, because it is God's gospel (cf. Rom. 1:1, 16; 2:16; Gal. 1:6-9, 11-12, 16; 2:2, 5-9)? Some have noted that in Romans Paul casts no reflections upon Judaizers or upon the apostles in Jerusalem, and that he does not refer directly to any struggle over the law which he had experienced so recently in Galatia and Corinth. They have suggested that he takes this attitude in this composition in order to win favour with his potential readers in Rome. Wisdom might indeed dictate such a procedure if the church in Rome was primarily composed of Jewish Christians with very strong Judaistic leanings. It would dictate it less if it was primarily a Gentile church already experiencing the problems in the same way as the churches in Corinth and Galatia, for then we would expect a letter more like Galatians or the Corinthian letters. Paul had felt under no compulsion to curry favour or to deal respectfully with such opposition when he found it in any of his own Gentile churches (cf., e.g., II Cor. 10:7, 12; 11:5, 12-15; 12:11-13; Gal. 2:4, 6, 11-14; 5:12). It is doubtful whether the need for financial support would be a determining factor. Respect for the position of Rome may have influenced his procedure, but even that is doubtful in the case of Paul.

The body of the speech, which it is being suggested was to be delivered in Jerusalem, begins with the statement of a basic thesis (1:16-17). The theology contained in the expansion of the thesis in 1:18-11:36 has been thoroughly discussed by others and need not be dealt with in detail here, except to note the unity of the whole around the basic theme, ecumenism, into which every passage is tied and which successively unfolds to its desired end. But as Paul develops his argument it is evident that on the whole he is addressing Jewish Christians. In establishing the universality of

God's revelation of himself and of his law, the universal nature of sin, and the universal need for mercy, he talks about the Gentiles. He does not address them as "you" but refers to them as "they" (1:18-32; 2:14-16, et passim). On the other hand he talks to the Jewish Christians, not about them (2:1-5, 17-24, etc.); or he identifies himself with his Jewish Christian audience and addresses them as "we" (3:9, 19, 27, 31; 4:1, etc.). This would be peculiar if intended primarily for Gentile ears in Rome. Only in 2:1 does he seem to depart from this frame of reference and include all his listeners, Jews and Gentiles, as "you", in the somewhat ambiguous "O man, whoever you are"; and in reading on one discovers that he is not speaking to Gentiles at all, but to Jews.¹⁷

Again, references to the Jews throughout Romans not only occur in relation to the critical issues of the gospel, but seem to be purposefully phrased by Paul so as to remind his hearers that he himself is a Jew and does not dissociate himself from his people (cf., e.g., 3:2, 19, 31; 4:1; 7:1; 9:1-5; 10:1-2; 11:1, 12, 26). Here he reveals his pride in his own race, his kinship with them, and the peculiar and favoured position which they have in the purpose of God. In similar manner from 3:21 onwards he exalts the place of Christ, showing why, in the face of the universality of sin under law and therefore of the universal need of salvation apart from law, it is necessary for Christ to be God's answer to those who believe. So he demonstrates from the events of Israel's past that God acts in history as the universal God, a fact which the Israelites have historically and consistently maintained. By the use of diatribe he tactfully involves his opponents in the admission of his assertions.

At the very beginning of his exposition, however, Paul

mollifies the opponents of his gospel by stressing the priority of the Jews (Rom. 1:16; 2:9-10). While this was undoubtedly something that Paul, as a Jew, always assumed to be historically self-evident, so that what he says on this score in Romans is to be taken as sincere (see 3:1-2; 9:1-5; 11:16; 15:8-9), it is all the more surprising that this point is not brought out in any of his letters to other Gentile churches. The impression gained from his other letters is the reverse.¹⁸ In relation to salvation Jews hold no obvious advantage over believing Gentiles (Gal. 3:26-29). But in these other letters Paul is mainly addressing Gentiles, and he has no intention of erecting an unnecessary barrier between himself and his Gentile mission field. Now whether the Roman congregation was mainly Gentile or not, the area in the West to be evangelized was Gentile, and such bold statements of Jewish priority, if primarily written for Roman ears, would appear tactless and quite un-Pauline. This may be one reason why later on he feels compelled to apologize for his boldness in speaking as he does to a Gentile church that he has not seen (Rom. 15:14-15). But as an address to Judaizers in Jerusalem who were hostile to his missionary methods amongst Gentiles, such an emphasis could be deemed politic. Any Gentile Christians who might be present in Jerusalem as delegates from Paul's churches would certainly be aware of his need for such tact, and would appreciate his line of argument. The whole of 1:16-11:36 is then basically a presentation and promotion of his gospel as superseding the requirements of Jewish national cult practices, and as establishing the oneness of humanity in a common faith. The recurring motif is "For there is no distinction" (3:22; 10:12; cf. 2:9-11; 3:9, 19-20, 29-30; 4:11b-12; 5:12, 18; 10:4), and he concludes on the note of universal salvation in 11:32. Only in

11:13-32 does he turn his address to the Gentiles who are present, i.e., those who corporately represent the beneficiaries of God's acts through his people, the Jews. Thus the major section of the "letter" establishes the basis of his ecumenism in the thought modes of a Jewish Christian, which of course is necessary if Paul is addressing a partly hostile Jerusalem audience.

There would appear to be another reason why it was imperative for Paul to present his gospel in relation to ecumenism in full to his Palestinian opponents and friends, and this may be a determining factor in his organization of the development of his thought in 1:16-11:36. It has to deal with the necessity for the church to evangelize the world with the message of salvation. On the one hand, up to now Paul's major dispute had been with Judaizers. They posed the basic threat to racial ecumenism. According to Paul's report in Galatians of his second meeting with the leaders in Jerusalem, he had satisfactorily settled this issue, for the chief apostles accepted the Gentiles. Nevertheless, the rejection of Paul's gospel by Judaizing Jewish Christians was something of which Paul had had bitter experience since that meeting. The increase in missionary effort carried on by Palestinians in Paul's areas in this interval had been mainly Judaistic, i.e., anti-Gentile; therefore, it had not stemmed from an attitude such as Peter's towards the Gentiles. It would also appear that it was during the short time between the second meeting and the writing of Romans that Paul became acutely aware of the depth of the cleavage between the church and the non-Christian Jews.

On the other hand, the Jewish mission that was centred in Peter evidently continued as before; for there is no evidence to indicate any major change in the programme of the Jerusalem mission

as a result of their decision to recognize Gentile Christians.¹⁹ They continued their policy of missionizing Jews only and presumably awaited the Parousia when God would bring in the Gentiles.²⁰ They were of course sympathetic to racial ecumenism in principle, but they were not convinced of its necessity, or even of its desirability. Paul, however, because of his recent experiences, gained a new understanding of the church's mission, namely, that an immediate world-wide mission to the Gentiles by the whole church was imperative.

What reason can be given for the fact that it is only in Romans that the universalism of the gospel in the fullest sense is developed by Paul? Was this because he was writing to the Roman church, or because he was mentally at Jerusalem (where he would soon be) face to face with a situation which urgently required it? This universalism is considered on two levels. It is argued on a limited basis in Rom. 4 (cf. Gal. 3), where it is those "who believe" who are descendants of Abraham (cf. 4:11-12, 16). In Rom. 3:22 the "all who believe" refers to all believers who receive "the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ". The "all" in Rom. 4, e.g., "all his [Abraham's] descendants" (v. 16), refers to "us who believe in him that raised from the dead Jesus our Lord" (v. 24). The belief is focused on the activity of God in Christ. This opens the way for Gentiles to participate in salvation on an equal footing with Jews who believe (4:11-12). Paul is paralleling the faith of Abraham with the faith of believers. As Abraham had faith that God could make him "the father of many nations" (v. 17) from the sterile womb of Sarah (v. 19), so the believer has faith that God can, and did in Christ, bring life out of death. The universalism he is discussing is something that exists in the present state of the

children of faith. They are justified because they believe in God's power and faithfulness to fulfil his promises and that he is already doing so (4:13, 17, 20, 23-25). In his programme of establishing the principle of ecumenism in history, Paul does not go outside the community of faith, because conditions in the world are not right for it, indeed the right attitudes are lacking (1:13-3:18). In that sense his ecumenism may seem to be a restricted one (3:22).²¹

Paul goes on, however, in ch. 5 to a higher level of universalism, the effectual fulfilment of which lies beyond the responsibility of the apostle or the church, but which is nevertheless the basis of the apostle's primary task, the preaching of the gospel to the ends of the earth. This is a universalism beyond historical time or man's ability to effect it. In ch. 4 Paul is looking ahead to ch. 5 where he describes what it is that God has done in Christ's death and resurrection.²² There he moves away from the realm of a limited universalism to one that is as wide as humanity, but is an object of eschatological hope.

To explain what he means, Paul goes back to the first man. Adam is the first human sinner, who, because he sinned, dies (5:12).²³ Christ, however, is the first man declared righteous in the sight of God (5:18), and therefore is the first who lives (5:12-21). If the parallelism is to be maintained, this analogy would seem to imply that, as all who participate in Adam die, so all who believe and so participate in Christ's act of righteousness live. The parallelism is more exact in v. 18, "one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men [πάντας ἀνθρώπους], so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men [πάντας ἀνθρώπους]",²⁴ for if πάντας means all universally in the one it must also mean all without qualification in the other.

Likewise, in v. 19a one man causes many (οἱ πολλοί) to sin, and if this means all humanity then correspondingly οἱ πολλοί in 19b would also have to mean the same, or the parallelism is destroyed.²⁵

So, too, in 5:16, the same universality comes to light in the opposing terms "one" (κρίμα ἐξ ἑνός, judgment from the one offence, or death for all) and "many" (χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα, grace shown universally towards the universal presence of sin, leading to universal justification). Because v. 17 seems to be explained by vv. 16 and 18, it would appear that the participial qualification, "those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness", is a parenthetical reference to the conditions of the present eschatological age in which the age of Adam and the age of Christ overlap,²⁶ and so is not to be construed as limiting ultimate grace to believers only. Otherwise the "much more" (πολλῷ μᾶλλον) of v. 17 would not have the same force as the πολλῷ μᾶλλον of v. 15, for whereas in v. 15 it contrasts the two supposed universals, the many who trespass and the many who receive the free gift of grace, in v. 17 it would then be qualitative and limiting, contrasting not "one" and "many", but the reign of life and the reign of death. But if the universality in these examples is apparent only and is to be understood as limited to all present believers, then Adam is the greater, which is hardly what Paul intends in the total picture he is drawing. Verse 20 again seems to strengthen the assertions made in vv. 18 and 19, and to mean that the abounding of grace far exceeds the abounding of sin, quantitatively as well as qualitatively.

The significance of Adam, however, as a type of the one to come is inadequately understood if Christ is merely thought of as the first man of the redeemed humanity. Of course he is that, but

he is also much more. In Paul's thought, Adam is not thought of in terms of any heavenly man who descends to earth or who is an incarnation of a heavenly prototype. He is just the first man, who because he rebels allows sin to enter and death to reign. Christ, on the other hand, is God's Son who descends to earth, dies a human death, and is raised the first of the redeemed mankind. As pre-existent Man he is therefore eschatological Man, the τέλειος Man, whereas Adam was not protological Man.²⁷

Up to this point Paul has spoken in objective terms of the ontological and historical side of God's unfolding plan leading toward universal salvation. Now he restates this in terms of the inward experience of his hearers. From Paul's point of view they did not comprehend their new state of existence, because in fact they did not comprehend their old state under the law, and therefore the significance of their election. His audience may conceivably have followed his argument from history and tradition, but he presumes it left them confused in relation to their understanding of the law. So it is at this point (6:1) that he knows the Judaizer wants to call a halt to a seemingly ludicrous situation which appeared in 5:20. But instead of dealing immediately with the question which he had raised, Paul begins with his audience's own experience of being baptized into Christ, its significance in terms of sin, and its relation to the new situation which has come into being. They of course would not deny their participation in Christ, and so according to Paul they could not deny having died to their Jewish law, in that in their experience of Christ they had been set free from the law's impossible absolute demands and resulting condemnation; they now live in the Spirit (7:6).²⁸ That being so, the thematic refrain, even though not stated, is implied in 6:3-7:6,

"there is no distinction" in Christ.

It is at this stage of the argument (7:7-25) that Paul can affirm the absolute nature of the law, on which he can establish his solidarity with his Judaizing brothers (to v. 12), for now the way is open for a Christian appreciation of the law, viz., as God's holy, ultimate, and perfect standard which per se stands over against man. The revelation of law was merely to awaken the awareness of "ought" (7:7-12). Verses 13-25 voice this universal human experience of frustration in the tension between the "ought" and the "cannot" as reflected upon from the vantage point of Christian experience.²⁹

The human experience of either Jew or Gentile depicted in vv. 13-24, 25b finds its resolution in 25a. Again in the background of both 7:25a and 8:1 is the motif, "there is no distinction". Paul's listeners understand the scope of his terms. The transitional statement (8:1) is justifiable not only because of the universalism of his preceding argument but also because of the inclusiveness of what follows, the life in the Spirit (8:2-17). In Christ God has awakened the other necessary awareness, viz., that the achievement of the ultimates and of the absolutes of the law are part of God's creative activity, not man's (cf. 7:24-25a). What man can never achieve himself, God has now achieved in principle in Christ (8:1-4); and this, through participation in Christ--the Spirit living in the believer--man can experience as something operative in present existence (cf. 6:19c, 22; 7:6; 8:1-2, 5b, 12-17), even though its fulfilment is realizable only eschatologically (vv. 23-25). Then in vv. 18-39 Paul carries his argument from this level experienced now by all believers to a cosmic level in which all creation will experience redemption at the Last Day (cf. Is. 11:6-9; 35:1-2;

65:17-25; 66:22a). Since Paul is describing salvation from the point of view of the church's present experience, it would seem that in keeping with the implications of his argument of 5:18, he should mean to include the rest of unredeemed humanity with creation's renewal. In Hebrew thought creation involves humanity. Rather than this being an argument against a Pauline concept of universalism of salvation, it strengthens it. Christ's redemption is cosmic. The eschatological unity restores the protological unity.³⁰

Nevertheless, it is likely that Paul has another objective in mind for this section, a fact which soon becomes apparent, i.e., the new "elect" (8:28-33). Election is described here in terms of the situation of his listeners. He is speaking about universalism as it is related to those in Christ, who are predestined to conform to his image now. All creation including the elect themselves groan for the revelation of the elect at the Last Day, for then takes place the great transformation. But the elect exist now. The predestined are "called", "justified", "glorified" (all past tenses). They are therefore terms which describe those who love God in Christ now, i.e., the extant church. Nothing can separate these elect from God's love in Christ (vv. 34-39).³¹ Thus having finally manoeuvred into this strategic position, Paul now makes his boldest and his decisive attack on Judaistic exclusivism (it can hardly be said that he was in any sense on the defensive), "Who shall bring any charge against God's elect? It is God who justifies; who is to condemn? . . ." (vv. 33ff., cf. Job 40:2). It is the mortal blow. Universalism of election through faith in Christ is established. Who dares take issue with God? It is no wonder that so many scholars find this to be the climax of the "letter".³²

Thus chapters 9-11 have long been a problem for exegetes.

To be sure, all try to weave 9-11 into the "letter", but often quite lamely. Dodd suggests that it could be removed bodily without harm to the "letter", since it is probably an earlier sermon bodily inserted.³³ Anders Nygren,³⁴ to be sure, sees it as an organic part of the "letter", though not as an advance in the argument, but rather as an explanation of the apparent contradiction in the problem of God's righteousness in which Paul has become involved, a contradiction which he must resolve. But from that point of view, though necessary, the argument does not thereby become an integral part of the composition, but is the result of a poorly laid plan of argumentation, and is merely a defensive action to forestall Jewish criticism in Rome which might stigmatize him as anti-Jewish. None of these answers is satisfactory. Nor is Jervell's, who, though he rightly sees 1:16-11:36 as the contents of Paul's argument to be used in Jerusalem, nevertheless wrongly concludes that Paul's purpose in writing 9-11 is to show the Romans that the Jewish threat against his life is entirely unjustified, since he is really missionizing for their salvation.³⁵ But this would seem to be a strange and condescending admission for a sincere missionary to the Gentiles to make to a Gentile congregation, which would hardly promote his cause and indeed one which would make the Gentiles merely a means to an end, which is hardly in the spirit of Paul's ecumenism as reflected in all his other letters. This follows, however, only from Jervell's view that Romans is a letter to the Roman church in which Paul discloses to his readers the contents of his defence in Jerusalem, and that Paul here reveals an unresolved struggle going on within himself as in his writing he contemplated the coming visit to Jerusalem where he must justify his position before the mother church. Although in some important respects

Jervell appears close to the background situation suggested in this study, yet in failing to grasp Paul's acute, historical situation and the positive attitude to that situation which had been Paul's from the beginning of his career, he fails to grasp the main point and import of the "letter".

From the point of view suggested by this study, chs. 9-11 are an integral part of the speech itself and carry the argument a stage further. Paul has just dealt a decisive blow to the Judaizers in his audience, and if that were Paul's intent, then 8:39 would be an excellent climax and conclusion. But that is not his intent. The goal of the speech is yet to come. Therefore, 8:39 is only the climax of the first stage. Paul goes to Jerusalem to unite a church that he is convinced must be ecumenical and to rouse it to mission. He does not go to destroy a large and important segment of it, but is concerned, as they are, with the reconstruction of Israel, though within the context of a universal salvation.

In effect Paul is now extending the right hand of fellowship to his Jewish Christian brethren by showing them that he is as much shaken by the Jewish predicament as they are; for he is one of them, a loyal Jew; and to the Jews belong the historical heritage and promises (9:1-5). This, however, is radically different from saying that within himself he is still trying to resolve these questions. Having won his battle for universalism of election, he still must explain to his brothers this new situation in which every Jew in Christ now finds himself in relation to his people. It is only at this stage of his speech that Paul can possibly deal with this problem, which is unresolved not within Paul himself but within the Judaizer and the Jerusalem apostles. So Paul recapitulates his whole argument, but from a fresh angle, i.e., from the point of view

of God's freedom to do as he will and to fulfil his plan and his promises in his own mysterious way. All this would hardly be necessary for a Gentile church with a few Jewish Christians (possibly mostly Hellenists) in Rome. Nor would so much midrashic explanation of Scriptural citations (the largest section of diatribe and the most extensive use of Scripture quotations in all Paul's letters) be necessary to prove this point for such people in Rome, but for an audience in Jerusalem it would be very much so. Admittedly, he uses the third person plural in reference to his people, but he is talking to Jewish Christians who are as much "elected" according to Paul's new definition (ch. 8) as any Gentile Christian, and so are in a category distinct from non-Christian Jews.

In 9:6b Paul makes a startling observation which in principle his Jewish audience cannot deny, as his Scriptural examples immediately following remind them. He observes, "For not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel" (9:6b; cf. 2:28, 29). Abraham is not Israel, nor are all his descendants numbered with the elect; likewise with Isaac. This all Paul's Jewish listeners know. Jacob alone is Israel (Gen. 32:28; 35:10-12, 22b-26; ch. 49). Every Jew to whom Paul speaks therefore knows that every descendant of Israel (Jacob) is per se of Israel (cf. Phil. 3:5), yet Paul begins his reconstruction programme with this declaration.

Before going any further with his analysis of election, Paul provides his listeners with a key with which they can understand their present problem, that is, that God is free to do just as he pleases (9:14-29). So Paul proceeds to the new ecumenical election, "even us whom he has called, not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles" (v. 24)--the recurring motif. Then he states the reason for the present rejection of the Jews, which is the story

behind God's latest limitation of election, that is, the one that occurs now within the family of Jacob (Israel). He reassures his hearers of his own deep concern about this matter (10:1), but can testify (undoubtedly from his own opposition as a persecuting Jew, and from his experience with Jews who have been fighting his mission) that though non-believing Jews have a zeal for God, "it is not enlightened" (10:2). They remain hardened to what God has done for them and for all humanity in Christ (cf. 9:32-33; 10:3-4). He reasserts that salvation is in Christ (10:5-11), and again brings in his main theme, "For there is no distinction . . ."; election is now open to all humanity (10:12-13). As the Jewish Christians must admit, the unbelieving Jews have no one to blame but themselves. All have heard. Those to whom he speaks have themselves been preachers carrying the word of Christ to them (vv. 14-21; cf. Gal. 2:7-9).³⁶

The next is a point in ecumenism. Israel is not rejected. Can Paul mean Israel en masse whom he has just said were rejected? His argument requires the concept of corporate solidarity as the key to its interpretation, just as may be the case with the concept of "the full number of the Gentiles". The present elect of Israel represent the whole of Israel and is its continuum (11:16). In historical existence there is rejection. Israel is again experiencing it. But Israel as such is not rejected; there is always a remnant (11:2-4); so now a remnant is numbered with the present "elect" (cf. 11:1, 5). But the present elect Israel (by implication not just the Gentiles grafted in but even the natural branches that have been left on the tree, 11:21-22) is supported by the great root, i.e., Israel of the original election (cf. v. 18).³⁷

If the argument of Romans is intended to show God's righteousness (so Nygren³⁸), then Paul seems to flounder on the

problem of Israel's rejection. But is 1:16-11:36 written to defend or to systematize such a theological proposition in itself, which would at once cut off 12:1-15:13 as integral to the argument? The frequently repeated motif, "there is no distinction", with its several variations throughout the entire address, makes this very doubtful, but rather indicates that the motif itself, i.e., ecumenism (the purport of 1:16), is its main theme and Paul's purpose for writing it. God's righteousness is indeed revealed, but this is a secondary theme (1:17) to support the main one (1:16). Paul has now conclusively demonstrated that election is by God's choice. If God therefore rejects Israel, God is true to himself. Paul will also show that the same holds true for God's promises. What Paul is now explaining to his listeners is the conflict which they themselves are experiencing between the facts of history and experience on the one hand and the eschatological ultimates on the other. They see Gentiles coming in, but, except for a remnant, know that Jews are staying out. This is not the eschatological programme as generally anticipated. So though at this point Paul addresses the Gentiles in the group that they too may see things in their proper perspective and not become arrogant, since ecumenism demands an equality-in-love on the part of its participants, his attention is evidently still directed towards explaining to the Jewish Christians the meaning of the Jewish situation. They must see that rejection is still part of God's planned use of Israel to fulfil his ultimate purpose in creation (11:11-15).³⁹ Once the "full number" of Gentiles are in, then all Israel, $\pi\alpha\varsigma \text{ Ἰσραηλ}$, will be saved (11:26). The gifts and the call of God are ultimately irrevocable (11:29).

In such exposition of texts and argumentation chs. 9-11 are

to be seen not as Paul's defence but as his open challenge to the Jewish Christians to accept their call to universal, ecumenical mission at once, for, by implication, even they, part of the present elect, can also be rejected. God is still free to prune for the sake of his purposes in historical time (11:22; cf. 11:25, possibly addressed to both Jewish and Gentile Christians in the audience; cf. also Gal. 1:8-9), if any of the present elect fail to respond to their call as the non-Christian Jews have done. Election is for a purpose. Because of the nature and goal of the address, it is suggested here that in 10:14-21 Paul is not only putting the blame for rejection upon the Jews themselves but is also challenging his listeners to carry the gospel to the ends of the world (cf. also 11:13b-25), for 10:14-21 follows immediately upon the universalism of salvation noted in vv. 11-13. The Scriptural quotations refer to world-wide preaching and to the influx of Gentiles. Verses 14-17 are a call to preach to all the world (as the following verses indicate by their description of the areas covered by the preaching up to now), and argue that naturally the word went to the ends of the earth because those who had something to proclaim were sent to proclaim it (vv. 14-15), and by inference the same holds true for all who are apostles of the gospel. No distinction has been made in the preaching, and none is to be made. To be sure, the Jews did not respond to this world-wide preaching, but that is not the fault of the missionaries. The Jews heard the message. Thus Paul here used the universalism of the call to preach to underline the Jews' own responsibility for their rejection. But he also uses it to emphasize the call to witness to the ends of the earth, to win Gentiles, and so, from the point of view of the intent of his address, to secure the interest of the Jews to whom he speaks for his ecumenical

mission to win Gentiles and so to win all Israel,⁴⁰ and finally, as Paul's real eschatological goal for this section and for the theological section of the address (note its climactic position), to win all mankind (11:30-32).⁴¹ Upon that final note of ecumenism he sings his song in praise of God's unsearchable ways (vv. 33-36).

Many see this as the end of the main part of the "letter" and chs. 12:1-15:13 as dealing with various unrelated ethical problems arising among the various groups in Rome. Those who see it as connected with the preceding theological section find difficulty in making it a significant addition; and if they do indicate that it is the point of the "letter", then they find it hard to explain why so much involved Hebraic argumentation was necessary in the first place. In most cases, scholars regard it as an ethical section merely tacked on, in spite of the "therefore" in 12:1.⁴² But that "therefore" is important, and from the viewpoint taken here, relates the preceding with the following as the goal of the whole speech. Furthermore, the call to "present your bodies as a living sacrifice" (12:1), which introduces the "ethical" section, may be more than spiritual advice. If Paul is now coming to the goal of his speech, i.e., the application of his argument to the very problems with which the Jews and Gentile Christians have been embroiled, and so to the problems connected with the unification of the church, then what follows could tie in with these issues. Further, if the address is meant for Jerusalem ears, then it must be remembered that unconverted, hostile Jews, whom both Judaizers and the Jerusalem apostles feared, were just outside their doors. In this critical situation Paul is only asking them to do what he has done (cf. II Cor. 1:4, 6, 8; 4:8-10; 11:23-29; Gal. 6:17; I Thess. 2:2-16; 3:4) and is still prepared to do (cf. Rom. 15:31a; Phil. 2:17), viz., for the sake of

the calling, for the sake of the gospel, be a "living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God". Such living for the ecumenical gospel may mean the supreme sacrifice, especially for the Palestinian Jewish Christian. The murdering of Christians had already begun in Jerusalem; riots had occurred in Gentile lands. In this situation it is doubtful whether Paul was "spiritualizing" anything. Life was too raw, the challenge too great, the sacrifice too real. For a speech delivered in Jerusalem for the purpose of uniting a church behind a fearless ecumenical missionary programme, 12:1-15:13 would be both pertinent and a climax.⁴³ This is exactly what one should expect from παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί of 12:1, when 1:16-15:13 is seen as an entity originally distinct from the rest of Romans.⁴⁴

This theologically based universal mission which is to send Paul on to Spain, and perhaps others in Jerusalem on to remote parts of the earth until the fullness of the Gentiles comes, leaves the ultimates in God's hands; but the present stage of God's ultimate universal purpose, confined though it may be to the believers who already in some sense experience salvation, is also of tremendous import. For it is in them that the practical effects of unity in Christ are already evident. The church's responsibility to effect equality and fellowship rests wholly within itself, a demonstration to the world by a colony of the Kingdom of God on earth. So from this standpoint also Rom. 12:1-15:13 would be the climax of an argument addressed to the gathered church in Jerusalem. To these practical matters in which the church is involved Paul now turns.

Paul's theological argument in Romans is of necessity detailed in order to establish the ground for the equality that he is convinced must be effected in the existing church. The weak in

the Jewish Christian church might, however, agree to the theological principle of equality before God that Paul preaches, without being ready or able to relate it to actual conditions. It is this gulf between the strong and the weak, that is, between those governed by the sense of living in the eschatological present and those not so governed that Paul has to bridge in his argument. Having done this in 1:16-11:36, he then proceeds to demonstrate the relevance of such a sense to life in the historical Christian community by applying it to existing ethical problems dividing the church. To announce what has taken place eschatologically and cosmically "in Christ" is to announce what must take place "in Christ" in the world, i.e., in the existing church.

This is the point where Paul's gospel becomes effectual in the actual life of the church. That which is still future and in the hands of God, beyond man's scope or power of effecting, is nevertheless also generative in the historical conditions of the world in the body of Christ, where that which essentially already is becomes actualized (Rom. 12:1-2, which is the statement of his thesis for this section of his address). This is Paul's understanding of the eschatological significance of God's act in Christ. The potential power of his gospel is contained in the theological section of his argument, but its practical application for those who are now in Christ follows in the ethical section. This section (12:1-15:13), in that case, does not deal with problems in a particular church or churches, but with those which belong to the whole Christian community, and it is this which makes this section a climax to the whole exposition. The theological argument which has led his hearers to appreciate their existing eschatological position has as its consequence that they shall recognize their responsibility

not only for proclaiming it to all the world, but also for making it effective within the whole church.

In the mission field Paul had worked for equality amongst Christians; the principle of the unity of mankind in Christ expressed in Gal. 3:28 was for the Christian community a fact to be implemented at once. In Romans he draws the same consequences from his theology with relation to the structuring of the church. This is the final objective of his whole journey to Jerusalem with the offering, i.e., to secure the visible, practical, structural (and not merely symbolic) unity of all believers, Jews and Gentiles, in Christ (15:5-13). This is why it is necessary for Paul to return with the offering to Jerusalem. If the purpose of that offering is rejected, then the Jewish part of the church, whose centre is Jerusalem, will fail the gospel as Paul knows it (cf. 15:31-32). If it is accepted it can only be accepted on these terms, i.e., by the agreement of the Judaizers to a united church with all parties being received into full and equal fellowship.⁴⁵

Paul therefore in the last chapters of Romans expounds equality in Christ, though he is not blind to the evident inequalities of grace. Such inequality of God-given talents, however, does not mean differentiation of status (12:3-8; cf. I Cor. 12:4-30), but rather of responsibility or function for the sake of the community, which is conceived as a body whose members are identified with one another (Rom. 12:5), the relationship between them being determined by love expressed in terms of brotherly affection, and so a corporate body of individuals of inestimable worth to one another (12:9-10).⁴⁶ Included is the giver who gives whole-heartedly, i.e., sincerely and enthusiastically (12:8b), according to Paul's understanding of the significance of Christian brotherhood or the nature of *κοινωνία*

(v. 13a) as a sharing of material and spiritual blessings (cf. 15:25-27), which meets the needs of the brother and of the brotherhood.⁴⁷ It is the necessary Christian way of building community. The motivation is not duty, but the inner necessity of compulsion, i.e., unhypocritical love (cf. 12:9a, 10a). In such love, no Christian who is rich in material things can be content or happy as long as there is one brother who is in want (cf. 12:10a where *φιλόστοργοι* indicates the tender love between members of an intimate family).

One implication of Paul's thought in 12:8b-13, therefore, is that none can be satisfied until full economic equality is achieved. This giving (i.e., by those in a position to do so, v. 8b) is enthusiastic and whole-hearted. Its basis is found in the nature of the *κοινωνία*, a body of many interrelated members, "members one of another" (v. 5), where the kind of loving concern exhibited is that demonstrated in devoted parental or family relationships. Paul undoubtedly meant this literally, because he very likely participated in it fully himself. Though in this situation he makes no personal reference to his own example, yet this may lie behind his words, and give weight to them with his audience.

From the point of view of Paul's ecumenism, one need not dwell on his view of the state (13:1-7) except to note that it may have a bearing on the expansion of the church in the context of the unity which the empire had given to the world. One might also see reflected in his respect for the state its protection of his own interests in Corinth only months earlier. His references within this section to the authority of the state might also lend support to the suggestion that the body of the letter was primarily written for delivery in Jerusalem. For in Palestine the Zealot movement was

growing and was to bring about open revolt against Rome in A.D. 66. It is hard to see how such a question, which concerned the right of Rome to govern the people of Rome itself or to tax its own residents, could have been thought by Paul as something contested by Christians living there, where the might and authority of the imperial state was concentrated. But if the document was composed to be read in Jerusalem, then the question could be appropriate.⁴⁸

In 14:1-15:13 Paul returns to the basic problem troubling the Gentile mission. The previous ethical section, like the theological section 1:16-11:36, is more general in its application to the total life of the Christian in the $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ and in relation to the world. Now Paul comes to the vital issue that has plagued him throughout his Gentile mission, how to have a common life, a unity of Jewish and Gentile brothers in active, genuine fellowship. It is a practical, pertinent climax, for unless this question was squarely faced, there could not be the unity or equality of a body (12:4-5) or of a close-knit family (cf. 12:10; also I Cor. 13:1-14:1a). This question was evidently untouched in his previous journey to Jerusalem, but he now perceives that it can only be dealt with after establishing a sound, theological foundation on which to erect the basic principles of ethical behaviour which describe the Christian $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$, and which must be approved, if the offering is to be a symbol of unity--if indeed it is to be accepted at all.

In this section (14:1-15:13) Paul addresses mainly those among his audience who are "strong" (cf. 14:1, 15-22; 15:1), i.e., those who are able to live in their new faith without old cultic fears, who perceive that all foods are God's pure and undefiled gifts meant for human consumption (14:14a). One does not have to presume that Paul has in mind Gentile Christians in Rome in order to

assume the predominance of the strong among those addressed; one needs only to remember that the core of the Jerusalem church are also included under such terms (cf. Gal. 2:7-10, 12a, 14b), and that the delegates from Paul's churches are to be in attendance. Whether the strong were in the majority at this meeting is of course not known, but Paul must have realized that Palestinian Christians of a far less liberal outlook than those represented by Peter predominated in the Judaeon churches. So the "weak" and the "strong" could well describe those whom he expects to be present. To this congregation of Christians Paul now outlines the attitudes that are applicable throughout the world-wide community of those in-Christ towards the practical matters of table fellowship that have been disrupting the unity of Jewish and Gentile Christians and contradicting the gospel of ecumenism which he discussed in the theological section of his address.

Paul can allow only one principle to prevail, namely, love (13:8-10; 14:15). As regards the relation of weak and strong (14:1-15:13) such love issues in the respect of the conscience of those worried by diet and observance of days (cf. 14:15a). Both the weak and the strong are servants of the same Lord (14:3-4). Both give thanks to God (v. 6). Both live and die to the same Lord (vv. 8-9). So in their common life and concern, they are not to judge one another in these matters (vv. 10-13a), but are to endeavour to help one another (14:13b, 19; 15:1-2, 5). Paul lets them know where he stands on the issue of uncleanness of food (14:14a, 20b), and then he removes what his audience thinks is at the centre of the issue, which is dividing Jews and Gentiles in the Christian community, namely, cultic laws and practices (cf. 14:2), and slips in that which rightfully belongs there, namely, love (14:15a). In this way,

he places the responsibility for Christian unity in the heart of every believer, strong or weak, by declaring that this is the essence of the Kingdom of God (14:17-18), the object of his gospel (cf. 15:5-6).

Though Paul is convinced of the truth of his general assertions, he remains thoroughly practical. Both the weak and the strong are accepted by God and are pleasing to God (14:3, 17-18). Yet one's conscience should be one's guide in one's own practice, for one should not go against its dictates (vv. 14b, 22, 23). The strong, however, should understand the weak and in love respect their conscience, and not demonstrate their freedom to indulge, but rather their graciousness to forbear (14:20-21; 15:1-2). In this way they may achieve unity, and as a community glorify God (15:5, 6). So in concluding the ethical section Paul returns to the basis of his argument; oneness of community in which the equality of all is recognized and achieved in love.

Paul's Purpose in Writing to the Romans

If the above reconstruction of the writing of Rom. 1:16-15:13 to Jerusalem is plausible, then is there evidence in the letter that might suggest why its dispatch in its entirety to Rome was thought to be necessary? It has been noted that Paul was thoroughly convinced of the authenticity of his gospel, and that no other was possible in addition to it. It has also been seen that other gospels were being preached by powerful people who supposedly represented Jerusalem, which he has had to brand as false. He also knew that his life was in danger. This knowledge of the threat of enemies is apparently reflected in his statement in Rom. 15:31 that danger from the Jews lurked in Jerusalem.⁴⁹ But to Jerusalem he must go. This suggests a possible reason why the whole presentation

of his gospel, regardless of its Jewish orientation, was sent to the Gentile church in Rome (which was not represented personally in the proceedings at Jerusalem, yet which he wishes to tie into the structure of a visible, ecumenical church as an important congregation of the Roman Empire, the centre of the world of civilized man), and possibly to other centres as well. For with very powerful groups opposing his gospel throughout the Gentile world, as are indicated by his Corinthian and Galatian correspondence, he must have realized that if his worst fears should occur (i.e., his death and the rejection of his gospel and of the offering in Jerusalem), then his own churches, and possibly even his co-workers, would succumb to the pressures, and his gospel would be lost to the world church. Therefore, that gospel must be distributed to all Gentile areas before he goes to Jerusalem.

Fellowship in Christ was manifestly the goal of Paul's world mission. Its broad concepts of world unity in absolute equality may have been unrealistic in the world, but inasmuch as Paul believed in the apocalyptic fulfilment of this ideal in the immediate future, the incongruity of effecting these goals in temporal conditions did not occur to him. For the principles of his gospel, which express the perfect will of God for mankind, demand implementation in time (Rom. 12:1-2). So Rome must be brought into the ecumenical structure of the church, as he saw it, like the other regions of the world. It is possible that this is the import of 1:11-13. This would be true even if he sent this section of the letter as a general cover for the presentation of his gospel to many churches, including those not of his own territory. If this was his intention, then by sending it he would not be working another man's field (15:20), nor would he be imposing himself as an apostle upon them,

but would only be presenting the gospel which alone, he was convinced, was the true one, and consequently upon which alone unity could be established, and which he trusted would therefore be universally adopted (cf. 15:31-32).⁵⁰ So the sending of a copy of his gospel to Rome and perhaps to other churches would be his last work before he left the East to assure that result.

Some commentators interpret 15:15-16 to mean that Paul thinks of himself as the priest par excellence to the Gentiles, and that he believes that he himself is the priest who will offer the Gentiles as a holy sacrifice to God.⁵¹ But λειτουργὸν (meaning "servant", here rendering a priestly service) Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη is without the article, as in every reference that Paul makes to his apostleship to the Gentiles. Likewise, at the same time as he writes about his own priestly service, he also recognizes that he is only one of many who perform the same priestly function. Thus he is not claiming special rights or privileges in this respect even in regard to the Romans. It is true that some, e.g., Sanday and Headlam⁵² and Lagrange⁵³ compare Paul's use here of ἱεουργοῦντα with that in IV Macc. 7:8, and so make the participle a substantive, referring to Paul as a sacrificial priest at the altar. But Leenhardt⁵⁴ sees it as a verbal participle, i.e., as Paul performing his priestly function by preaching the gospel to the Gentiles and so reconciling God and man; in other words, his whole ministry of preaching the gospel of God to the nations (ἔθνη) is his priestly service of preparing the offering, and the offering itself is all those who have been reconciled to God. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the offering is acceptable to God because it has been sanctified by the Holy Spirit (ἡγιασμένη ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ), which seems to be final proof, as far as Paul is concerned

(as we have noted before, pp. 85-88; cf. II Cor. 3:2-6; Gal. 2:7-9; I Thess. 1:2-10), that his gospel is the right one (Rom. 15:17-19a); that it is therefore the one which the whole church must use in its ministry as a means of preparing the whole world (ἐθνη in its universal sense) as an offering to God (v. 16); and that this ministry is the primary mission of the total church (cf. vv. 19b-21). Thus the sense of the passage, when seen against the background of the rest of Romans, seems to be that the gospel that Paul is offering is by its very nature the only one that can give the baptism of the Holy Spirit, because it is the only one that is in accord with God's revelation of his cosmic purpose in the total Christ-event. For according to Paul's gospel, God will not accept any form of status graded particularism but only an egalitarian universalism in Christ, i.e., in the eschatological (ultimate) Man, which is the real offering of love, the only offering that is acceptable to God.

This explanation of 15:15-16 fits in with the basic reason why Paul presents his argumentation in the body of Romans to Jerusalem, and indeed now to Rome, that is, to win the apostles in Jerusalem, the Judaizers, and Christians everywhere to what he is convinced is God's gospel, and to challenge them to accept their election as a call to the ecumenical mission. Hence, "so that the offering of the Gentiles [ἐθνη] may be acceptable, sanctified by the Holy Spirit" (15:16b) is the purpose of his writing his address for Jerusalem and of sending it to Rome and elsewhere, the purpose of his going to Jerusalem, and the purpose of his visiting Rome (the possible meaning of 1:13); for if all apostles, Jewish Christians and Gentiles, i.e., all missionaries, have this gospel, then not only Paul's Gentile converts but all Christians (cf. 15:19) will become one great offering offered to God by all missionaries

united as a body at the Parousia. In other words, Paul conceived of not only the church but even of the ministry itself as ecumenical, no priest of God--not even Paul himself--standing out alone above the others.

The idea that in this letter Paul was paving the way for making the Roman church the sponsor of his work in Spain can be entertained only with reservations.⁵⁵ As far as major financial support is concerned, however, Paul himself had always wished to remain economically independent and so free from any pressure to compromise his gospel. Hence if he is to remain consistent with his past policies he cannot lean on Rome for this kind of assistance. What Paul intended by 15:24 remains a problem. He may have wanted financial help for the journey to Spain, to send him on his way; but for him, this cannot mean burdening the church with the cost of his missionary enterprise.⁵⁶

Paul's mission programme in the East had involved several co-workers founding, nurturing, and consolidating churches in the expanding fields. There is no reason to suppose that Paul intends to change his policy in the West, yet the letter to the Romans is from Paul alone. It is not written in the "we" vein at all. That, however, is understandable, because Rome does not lie within the responsibility of his co-workers in the East. Thus it would not be a letter in which they would be included. This would seem to indicate that they are not co-workers with Paul outside their areas of missionary responsibility. There is no indication that they are going to Rome with him; the first person singular in the section of the letter dealing with his plans for coming to Rome and going on to Spain would suggest that they would not be accompanying him. Probably they are to remain attached as missionaries to cultivate the

regions of Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia while he himself goes to the West.

Paul tells the Roman church that he has fully preached the gospel "from Jerusalem and as far round as Illyricum" (15:19).⁵⁷ When he tells them that he is on the way to Spain, he also says that it will be by way of them (15:28). Like Jerusalem, therefore, Paul may intend to make Rome the starting point of the next sweep of the great circle. Knox⁵⁸ points out that κύκλος "usually meant a complete circle, however inexact or approximate", and not merely a "curving direction", so that Paul is thinking of "one great journey beginning and ending at Jerusalem, but encompassing the whole Mediterranean world" lying on both the north and south sides of the sea. That may be true, but of course Paul may still be saying that he has encircled his whole area as far away as Illyricum with the gospel. That is, he has developed and consolidated the work in these areas and is leaving his mission in these areas in the hands of reliable missionaries whom he himself has trained: he is therefore finished with this eastern territory and is now going back to Jerusalem, which will complete the circle. It is still a circle, even according to Knox's definition, roughly sketched though it may be. Paul is looking back over his career. The starting point of the circle was his first meeting with Peter in Jerusalem. Then he journeyed northward as far as North Galatia where he later evangelized; then westward across to Macedonia and probably to the Adriatic and to the borders of (or possibly even within) Illyricum; then southward to Achaia, again probably to the Adriatic and also down into the peninsula; and then eastward across the Aegean to Asia; and then back to Jerusalem. So he drew the circle. In the meantime he, with others, shaded in the whole area over which he had

actually travelled. After his consultation with the apostles in Jerusalem on his second visit there, Paul revisited his churches throughout his areas of missionary activity, again in an approximate circle, consolidating his mission. Now he is ready to return to Jerusalem with the offering, after which he will journey to new areas in the West, even to Spain. This verse, therefore, is an excellent summary of all the work that he has done so far, and fits with vv. 22-23. Indeed, it is also possible that he is giving the verse a dual meaning and so also is expressing his intention to continue the circle on a vaster scale, its next encircling stage being from Rome to Spain, and so on, until at last, as Knox suggests, he encircles the Mediterranean, approximately the known civilized world. Possibly, however, Paul is thinking of such encircling not solely as the result of the missionizing that he will be doing but also as the result of the missionizing that other apostles will be doing as they share with him in a co-operative world missionary enterprise.

Note on Philippians

This study could suggest a place and occasion of the writing of Philippians. Discussions on these questions are numerous,⁵⁹ but are based upon suppositions that in relation to evidence examined here seem on the whole to lead to unsatisfactory conclusions. For reasons stated below, it is conjectured that Philippians, possibly excepting 3:2-4:1, could only have been written after the third Jerusalem meeting, i.e., after Paul had presented his gospel before the Jewish Christian church.⁶⁰

1. Paul is now dissociated from his churches in the East in the sense that he no longer belongs to a corporate group who are currently at work in that area. The "we" letters belong to the

period when he was evangelizing those districts. Paul's apostolic function there is over. He has left the East (Rom. 15:23). It is up to them to carry on (Phil. 2:12-18) in the same obedience, working out their "own salvation" presumably under leadership trained by him during his previous long period of work. To this end much of the letter is directed as his parting words of counsel. The style of the address (1:1) is indeed similar to that of I and II Thessalonians, but throughout the Thessalonian correspondence Paul is identified with a circle of co-workers; here he is not. The similarity in address is not reproduced in a similarity of style throughout, and does not argue for the same period in Paul's ministry. Having argued his point of the matter of his apostleship, Paul returns to his preferred view of equality of mission before God, and couples Timothy with himself as "servants of Christ Jesus". Thus the letter itself reflects a change in the corporate situation. This would not be true at any time earlier than his leaving the East for the West, but it would be understandable if this is written after the third meeting in Jerusalem when he is ready to go to the West. Thus, it would seem, the place of origin of the letter cannot be Ephesus.

2. Counter arguments to the assertion that the frequent journeys back and forth from the place of imprisonment to Philippi argue against Caesarea are summarized by Kümmel.⁶¹ In addition, if Paul had taken delegates from Macedonia to Jerusalem, then these delegates immediately upon returning from Jerusalem could relate the trouble that Paul was in, and in response the Philippian church could send him aid by Epaphroditus. It should be noted that the aid was unrequested (cf. 4:11-14, 17)⁶² and so there is no need to question why he had not received help from Jerusalem.⁶³ At any

rate, pilgrims or business people travelling between Philippi and Palestine could carry messages back and forth. These travellers would not necessarily be limited to travelling by land.⁶⁴

3. The Christian social climate around Paul reflected in Philippians fits Caesarea better than either Rome or Ephesus. As was noted earlier, Paul was evidently on very good terms with the Christian missionaries in and around Asia. There is no evidence in Colossians, Philemon, or other earlier correspondence to indicate that he was surrounded by Christian workers with the attitudes reflected in Phil. 1:17, but rather that they respected him as their spokesman and counsellor. In addition, in Asia he was far from being destitute of fellow workers (cf. Col. 1:2, 7; 4:7, 10-17; Phlm. 2, 23-24; I Cor. 4:6; 16:12; II Cor. 8:18-19, 22), yet Phil. 2:21 implies that there was a scarcity of workers upon whom he could rely in the area where he was presently imprisoned.

We know nothing about the kind of gospel that was being preached in Rome, but on the basis of Phil. 1:14-18 it would be safe to say that if Paul were writing from Rome, then at this time the Christians in the neighbourhood were not preaching a Judaistic type of gospel. For preachers of false gospels received only condemnation from Paul (cf. II Cor. 11:13; Gal. 1:8-9), and that is not indicated here. The pretence, however, does not signify a false gospel, but false and arrogant motives behind the preaching. The area would seem, therefore, to be a Hellenistic Christian centre where not only Paul's type of gospel was being proclaimed but also where undercurrents of jealousy prevailed. These would be more explicable where he had formerly been well-known, yet where he had no special missionary function of his own which would encourage special loyalty to him, than in far away Rome where he was

virtually unknown.

4. Caesarea fits better than Rome with Paul's former plans. His mission in the East seems to have come to full maturity.⁶⁵ This would not be the case in Ephesus at all, when he had not yet consolidated his churches and bound them together in unity. The Philippians have an organization within their own church that is evidently functioning, and Paul can depend on them to "work out . . . [their] own salvation" (2:12). He plans to send Timothy to them, "who will be genuinely anxious for . . . [their] welfare" (2:20), and who is not expected back.⁶⁶ There is no indication in Romans (or in Acts) that Paul had intended to take any of his co-workers to Rome. It is more probable that he had trained them to carry on in the East. This seems to be the import of this passage. When Paul is set free, which he may still be expecting to happen soon, then he will hope to visit the Philippians (2:23-24). Paul would then be taking the land route to Rome, which for him would now be the safest way to go, especially if danger of murder by hostile Jews was a constant threat (cf. Acts 20:3). Conditions experienced in Rome or Caesarea, when compared to earlier ones in the East, would be no reason for a man like Paul to give up his visit to Spain.⁶⁷

5. Fear that there might be a fatal outcome to his present imprisonment persisted in Paul's mind. Though that might argue for a Roman imprisonment, it does not necessarily do so. Goguel⁶⁸ has shown that in his Caesarean confinement Paul was threatened with trial by the Sanhedrin, and that Festus, recognizing the right of the Sanhedrin to judge the case, was prepared to allow it and even to ensure that it took place. But Paul knew that trial by the Sanhedrin meant certain death. As a Roman citizen, he had the right to appeal to Caesar.⁶⁹ The letter, to be sure, was sent before this

stage had been reached, for he felt that he might be released. Festus could dismiss the case. But the Jews were after Paul, and Roman procurators played politics with pressure groups, as Goguel suggests was happening in this case. The Jews might even succeed in lynching Paul.⁷⁰ Such a threat was far worse in Caesarea than in Rome, and Paul himself must have known that in Rome there was a chance that his case would be dropped.⁷¹

The ecumenical note of Paul's previous letters is sounded once again in Philippians. The concept of participating in one another's joys and sorrows in realistic and concrete fashion is evident in the Philippians' sharing of Paul's suffering (cf. 4:10-19). This gives Paul joy (cf. 1:7), for it is a practical expression of the love he proclaimed (1:9-11). The oneness is vertical as well as horizontal, for God enters into the relationship as well (4:19).

When Paul speaks of "striving side by side for the faith of the gospel" (1:27), he is obviously referring to his gospel of unity, for the conflict is still with the same opponents with whom he has been contending (cf. 1:7). These need not be just pagan or Jewish enemies of the Cross, although 1:29-30 (cf. I Thess. 2:2; Acts 21:27-36) might suggest it, for another opponent threatened from within the church under the guise of apostles who taught a false gospel (cf. 3:2-4:1). In any case, unity of soul is meant, i.e., a united church.⁷²

Unity of a very concrete kind is indicated in 2:2-4, where again he stresses the harmony of the Christian community in which members have "the same love", live "in full accord" and are "of one mind" (2:2), i.e., united in spirit. This singleness of mind is explained more fully in vv. 3-4 where not selfishness and conceit,

but humility and interest in others is the motivating thought. Paul does not frown upon caring for one's own interests, which would include one's work; but he does not stop with self-interest, for it must end in concern for others. The "Hymn to Christ"⁷³ which follows, whether Paul's or not, is used by him as the supreme example of this selfless motivation which is the basis of action both within the church body and in the church's mission to the whole world (vv. 10-11).

Paul himself has been an example for them to follow (3:17; 4:9). What, if anything, he may be a witness to apart from general Christian deportment (4:8) he does not definitely say, but if the suggestions concerning his daily work are feasible, the reference to his example could have a bearing on these remarks about their concern about others (2:4) and lie behind the phrase "but you had no opportunity" (4:10b). The latter clause is generally taken to mean that the Philippians had been unaware of Paul's need, that he mildly chides their neglect of him, and that he excuses it on the basis of their ignorance of his need. But this does not fit the tone of love, longing, gratitude, and joy that Paul feels towards them in this letter or in this section, especially if he is actually relieving their anxiety over him by implying that the gift is greatly appreciated as a gift of love, even though he is not in dire need. If one takes into account the possible trade activity that Paul has been engaged in since he first started his work in Macedonia, then Paul may have needed personal financial help in Macedonia and in Corinth but not much, if any, since,⁷⁴ although undoubtedly he always encouraged partnership in the church's missionary activity (cf. II Cor. 10:15-16; Phil. 1:5; I Thess. 1:7-8). As he became more independent of such financial aid, so too his determination to

maintain that freedom strengthened (cf. 4:10-13). In that case, Paul could well say--and in the spirit of 4:10-13--"you had no opportunity". It is this Christian industry performed not only for the good of oneself but also for the good of the community in Christ, i.e., for the realization of an egalitarian society, that Paul preached by word (cf. II Cor. 8:8-15; 9:6-15) and by deed (cf. I Thess. 2:8-9). Thus for him ecumenism is far more than spiritual platitudes, but becomes concrete in realistic involvement in the daily activities of human existence.

About the ecumenical mission beyond church walls, i.e., the world-wide scope of the gospel, apart from the "Hymn to Christ" in 2:6-11, Paul says nothing. He may feel, perhaps because of a successful outcome to the Jerusalem meeting itself, that it is no longer an issue as far as the official ties of unity within the church are concerned, and therefore he takes for granted a united world church involved in a co-operative ecumenical mission to the world. But at most this can only be conjectured from his remark to the Philippians that he hopes to visit them soon, which, if written in Caesarea, would undoubtedly mean, on his way to Spain.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

In this study Paul's letters have been approached in the first instance less as the writings of a theologian than as documents affording first-hand evidence of his missionary practice, of his movements in relation to various regions, and of his methods and plans with relation both to individual churches and co-workers, from which to deduce now he understood his world-wide apostolic task. It has again and again appeared, however, that his missionary practice--Paul being the man he was as revealed in his letters--was not simply governed by circumstances and expediency but was also theologically motivated. Theology and practice may be seen to interact on each other. Thus theology determines the scope of the mission, as for example in his immediate intention after his conversion to preach to Gentiles, while circumstances affected the way in which at a certain time this intention was to be carried out, as for example in the collection for the saints. This theological motivation can be glimpsed here and there in Paul's letters, even though they were written to already established Christian communities for whom the mission in respect of them is in the past, but it is most evident in Romans, which, for whatever reason, is the most systematic and consistently theological of his letters--we have suggested as the reason that while it became an epistle for general distribution to the main centres of the church, or at least, as we know, to Rome, it was conceived as a developed argument not only for the

defence but for the promotion of his ecumenical gospel at the seat of Judaistic opposition, Jerusalem. The theological attitudes which make their appearance behind and within his missionary practice may then here be briefly summarized.

The starting point must be Paul's Hebraic belief in the one universal God.¹ In view of Paul's strong Christological emphasis it needs to be underlined how theocentric his thought is. The gospel is God's gospel (Rom. 1:1; 15:16; II Cor. 11:7; I Thess. 2:2, 8, 9; cf. I Thess. 2:13) even while it is also Christ's, and Paul had been set apart for it by God (Gal. 1:15ff.; cf. Rom. 1:1). The universality of the God of Israel was, of course, part of Israelite belief, though generally in the somewhat inoperative form that Gentiles would be added to Israel in the forthcoming salvation.² With Paul it moves into the centre. This is evident not only in his references to the purpose of the God of Israel and his appeal to the Old Testament scriptures when writing to churches that were predominantly Gentile in composition, but also particularly in the structure of Romans. Although "to the Jew first and then to the Greek" is still retained (Rom. 1:16; 2:9, 10), this letter begins not from the specific relation of the God of Israel to the Jews, but of the God of creation to mankind, and from the possibility of mankind perceiving God's eternal power and divinity through the works of creation. When Paul moves in chapter 5 to the universality of sin to which the gospel is the divine response, it is in terms of the sin of Adam and its universal consequences. Further, the difficult chapters 9-11, which to some scholars have seemed to be an intrusion, probably owe their place to the necessity for Paul of asserting God's will and purpose in the gospel as universal in the face of Israel's corporate rejection of it. The whole of mankind

are embraced by the gospel, though now it has to be in the form of to the Gentile first and then to the Jew.³

Paul's theocentric theology is, however, expressed in terms of God's righteousness. By this is meant not a static, abstract quality of God, but his activity towards mankind both in judgment and salvation. All mankind are sinners, and Jew and Gentile without distinction fall into the same category. What is peculiar to the systematic theological exposition in Romans is that the law, which is revealed and made more fully known to the elect people of Israel, is also not unknown to the Gentiles, and by reference to it all men stand under condemnation.⁴ Further, sin entered into the world through Adam, the first man, in whom all men are corporately united. There is apart from the gospel a universal unity in sin, so that both as regards origins in the act of God in creation and as regards the actual historical situation there is a unity of mankind before God.⁵ This understanding of human existence is in the background of Paul's ecumenical gospel and of the imperative of his mission. Hence his passionate assertion in Galatians and his more systematic exposition in Romans in relation to the preaching of the gospel of righteousness by faith as opposed to righteousness from works of the law. For the latter was appealed to by Judaizers to maintain a distinction between Jew and Gentile and a superiority of achievement by the Jew in relation to God's righteousness, and in this way the law was being put to a use for which it was not intended by God (to give life), and its divinely appointed purpose of bringing all men under condemnation was disastrously obscured. It is not clear whether Paul arrived at justification by faith from the moment of his conversion, as he seems to indicate in Phil. 3, or through the actual missionary and pastoral experience of having to deal with

Judaizers in his churches, but as he expounds it, especially in Galatians, it is bound up with the universality of the gospel. Not only is Abraham as the man of faith chosen as representative of the true character of Israel in its relation to God, but it is Abraham as the destined father of many nations, of mankind, to whom the gospel is preached in advance, and the sons of Abraham, those who reproduce his character, are the men of faith anywhere, Gentile as well as Jew.⁶

The obverse side of God's righteousness to judgment is salvation. The gospel is "the power of God for salvation" (Rom. 1:16). But both "judgment" and "salvation" were in late Jewish thought eschatological conceptions. In apocalyptic thinking God had in potential his plan to break the impasse of the thwarting of his creative purpose through man's sin, but this would only be revealed and put into operation in the eschatological period of history. But eschatology, being modelled to some extent on protology, or the doctrine of creation, was concerned not only with the "end things" as such, but with those final things as universal in their scope.⁷ There is abundant evidence in Paul's letters for the eschatological character of his thinking, and eschatology can be seen determining his answers to a whole range of theological and practical questions such as the death of believers in I Thess. 4 or sex and marriage in I Cor. 7, but it is also the gospel itself and the preaching of it which are eschatological. As Paul interprets the hope of Israel, God has not only intervened in history and revealed himself and his commandments to Abraham and to his descendants, but has given to Abraham, the father of Israel, his promise of the fulfilment of his creative plan in Abraham's seed (Gal. 3; Rom. 3-4). It is for this fulfilment of the promise of God's ultimate purpose in the ideal

Israel that the Jews have been waiting, and in that ideal Israel still to come all nations will find their fulfilment and creation will be restored to its protological glory. For Paul this fulfilment is already in process through the appearance of Christ "when the time had fully come" (Gal. 4:4), a thoroughly eschatological expression. For Paul Jesus is the Jewish messiah (e.g., Rom. 1:3), but this figures little in his letters. Primarily Jesus is for him "the Lord" and the eschatological Man, the new or second Adam. As "the Lord", which he is known as chiefly through his resurrection (Rom. 10:9), he is in principle and can only be the universal Lord (Rom. 10:12), the Lord of the whole created order (Phil. 2:9-11), and particularly in relation to the cosmological speculations at Colossae Paul is led to take this eschatological lordship of Christ back to creation itself.⁸ Christ is also the single "seed" of Abraham through whom the promise of the ideal Israel with its universal scope is, and is to be, realized. His death, which is his rejection by the empirical Israel, and his resurrection at the hands of God in the face of this, make him the sole basis of the fulfilment of Israel's hope. But he is further as the sole seed of Abraham also the eschatological and representative Man, who is the centre of man's new being, the second or ultimate Adam, who, like the first Adam, is inclusive of others, but who, unlike the first Adam, brings others into the new order of resurrection and glory and the eschatological life of righteousness demanded by the commandments of God. This order of life is beyond and supersedes all previous ages whether Jewish or Gentile, but Jews and Gentiles, coming into it from prior stages of man's existence, do not lose their identity, but in it contribute their own identity to the new unity. Ethnically the Jew remains a Jew and the Gentile a Gentile,

but both find equality and unity in which their multiplicity is absorbed without being destroyed.⁹

It is along this train of theological thought that we arrive at Paul's concept of the church, and it is significant that this should be so. In Gal. 3 and Rom. 3-11, where this theology is chiefly developed, neither the word "ekklesia" nor the expression "body (of Christ)" occur, yet it is the church about which Paul is talking. For the church for Paul is the corporate unity of all who believe God's power to accomplish what he wills for mankind and who perceive him doing so in Christ. They are through this faith and perception heirs of Abraham, possessors of God's promise to him and members of the true Israel.¹⁰ Although "church" itself is not a missionary term, it describes the intention and result of the mission, and its character is determined by the character of that mission.¹¹ It is the totality of the redeemed "in Christ", who corporately with Christ--who is the first-born amongst them and is the one who gives the whole its meaning--are the "body" of Christ, the seed of Abraham. Since Christ is the new or eschatological Man, the church is also new or eschatological; it is a new creation of those who are new creations in and through Christ (cf. I Cor. 12:12-27, esp. v. 27; II Cor. 5:17, 19). It is the "in-Christness" that is the distinctive characteristic of the church and of individual members of it.¹² In accordance with the ancient concept of solidarity Christ is an inclusive figure. As the single seed of Abraham he is the true Israel of God and those "in" him are that seed drawn from all the nations. He is the eschatological Man, the second Adam, and those "in" him are the community intended by God in creation. As born in the first Adam men are perishable, but as raised with Christ they are imperishable (I Cor. 15:42), and are

being "changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another" (II Cor. 3:18; cf. I Cor. 15:49). Those in Christ take on his image, and are no longer to be considered from a purely human point of view (II Cor. 5:16). This inclusive or corporate personality, of Christ in relation to this community, is the church.¹³ Metaphorically though not ontologically speaking it is the church in its totality, in its unity with Christ as a corporate personality, that is the body of Christ.¹⁴ It is here that distinctions are abolished. Further, what God has begun in Christ, and what those in Christ already participate in, is to find complete and universal fulfilment at the Parousia, when all mankind will be incorporated in him and will participate in his kingdom. Thus, as the end was already in the beginning, so now the beginning is in the end.

In this way Paul arrives at his ecumenicity. To be sure he does not arrive at it as a systematic theologian working logically through a scheme. At least this is not how it now appears in his letters, since at many points his statements are made in dealing with concrete and specific questions which have arisen in a particular local representation of the total church,¹⁵ though even here one may ask how far what is said arises directly from the local situation or from the application to the local situation of already firmly held theological conceptions. In Romans, however, Paul develops his argument for the ecumenical character of the gospel more systematically, and it is throughout a theological argument (1:16-11:31) with consequent ethical applications drawn (12:1-15:13). It is only in terms of the new eschatological stage of existence, and not in terms of the still existing, overlapping lower levels of human history that the unity of and the equalities in the church are presumed, applicable, and effectual. As a realist Paul knows that

in the prior stages in which man still lives under the conditions of the old Adam such equalities do not exist,¹⁶ but only in a corporate unity in the representative eschatological Man, the universally ultimate Man, the Christ. It follows from this--and Paul is clearly aware of it as he plans to go to Spain, and argues for it theologically, especially in Rom. 9-11--this fellowship of the church is a world-wide fellowship in the strictest terms; it is a body that is to extend to the uttermost parts of the known world and is to be racially inclusive (in Paul's terminology to be inclusive of all the nations). It is, indeed, only "in Christ" that the benefits of the gospel are and will ever be realized, but in Romans Paul shows that he could not be satisfied with a salvation limited to those presently in Christ or even to those who will be found in Christ at the Parousia. Ultimately all mankind will be gathered into that body in the kingdom of God. He makes the leap of faith that God is ultimately victorious in his creation and speaks in terms of all men (πάντας ἀνθρώπους Rom. 5:18; πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ 11:26; τοὺς πάντας 11:32).¹⁷

For Paul the time for this inclusion to begin had come with the glorification of Christ and the commencement of his reign. But this was not the interpretation put upon the situation by Judaizing Christians who still looked for the reign of the Messiah to begin at Christ's Parousia, and who were convinced that in the meantime salvation remained within the confines of Judaism. If Gentiles were to participate in this salvation they must be incorporated into Israel as Jews and not as Gentiles. The salvation of the Gentiles was to be God's act at the Parousia and not the mission of those already "in Christ". The time of the fulfilment had not arrived, and they waited for Christ to return.¹⁸ Thus arose a conflict of

interpretation over eschatology and the relation of Christ to it. For Paul, since the eschatological hour had arrived and Christ had begun to reign, and because this was God's act, incorporation in the true Israel of God was open to all. It was this that Jews found so shocking, i.e., that Gentiles should become part of Israel without first becoming Jews. It has been the contention of this thesis that this tension dates back to the very beginning of Paul's Christian career. Admittedly Paul's letters deal only with his work after his first meeting in Jerusalem, viz., from Philippi onwards, and not with his first three years spent in Damascus and Arabia, but even there it may be deduced from the fact that according to his own account he was singled out by the governor of Damascus for persecution and arrest that an ecumenical mission was already being carried on. If so, Paul's theology of mission is probably to be taken back to his conversion, and the probable point where a plan of operation was arrived at for missionizing the whole oecumene by dividing the world into regions where apostles would not overlap in their efforts was during his first meeting with them in Jerusalem--in the words of Acts, "'Depart; for I will send you far away to the Gentiles'" (Acts 22:21),¹⁹ and in Paul's own words, ". . . in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles" (Gal. 1:15-16), i.e., to all people without distinction in every nation.²⁰

Thus it would appear that the seeds of hostility between those in Paul's camp and those in the camp of the Judaizers were already planted in the theology of both camps. From the perspective of Paul's new revolutionary concepts conceived at the time of his experience of the resurrected and glorified Christ there can be no theological reason why there should be any delay on his part in going to the oecumene at once with the gospel for the oecumene.

Indeed, these concepts as a revolutionary statement of Israel's eschatology and messianic doctrine would seem to constitute an indicative of which the consequent imperative brooked no delay, and this the more so inasmuch as for Paul the interim time of the reign of the Messiah between its beginnings at the resurrection and its completion at the Parousia was to be short, limited to his own generation's lifetime. In the determination of the chronology of Paul's missionary activity suggested in this thesis it has been argued that Paul went "among the nations" first in Arabia and Damascus, and then not fourteen or seventeen years later but immediately after his first meeting in Jerusalem to Macedonia, Achaia, Asia, and planned to go to Spain, and that he did so according to a plan that in its rudimentary form he had arranged with his colleague in world-wide mission, Barnabas.²¹ The theology of mission which emerges in his letters would tend to support this chronology, for it was not a theology which entailed, or in which one would even expect, a long delay before setting out upon an ecumenical mission, or that would entertain for a lengthy period indecisiveness over the ethnic or social origins of prospective converts.

The ecumenicity inherent in this gospel of what God has accomplished in Christ for all mankind was enunciated by Paul in his advice and teaching in specific, practical situations, and from the potential within it concrete applications are made. For the community "in Christ", where interrelations between members-in-Christ needed specific definitions, we find Paul unfolding the gospel. Thus in the problems of the church in Corinth, ecumenicity meant sex equality (I Cor. 7).²² In the relations of rich and poor, or of the more richly endowed as against the less talented, ecumenicity meant

status equality (I Cor. 12-14; Rom. 12:3-8).²³ In the relations of Christian slave and Christian master in the household of Philemon, both master and slave being members in Christ, the status relationship is abolished in love, even though the functions of either might not necessarily be changed.²⁴ On occasions, this was not without actual physical consequences. In relations between rich and poor, the sharing of goods potentially equalized economic conditions.²⁵ The demand for economic effort was not, however, relinquished within the family of those in Christ (cf. Paul's own example in his work activity²⁶), but instead it was given new meaning and impetus in relation to the good of and the needs of the community in Christ, "that the members may have the same care for one another" (I Cor. 12:25; cf. Gal. 5:13-14; Phil. 2:2-4), striving "to excel in building up the church" (I Cor. 14:12). Distinctions between Jew and Greek or Gentile, i.e., religious as well as racial distinctions, dissolve in Christ;²⁷ and ritualistic peculiarities among the weak and the strong, differences basically not essential, are tolerated in one another in love (Rom. 14:1-15:6).²⁸ Mutual respect and understanding are requested for the sake of the essential unity and equality of all people in Christ. For there can be no distinctions in the relations existing between members of the same body (cf. I Cor. 12; Rom. 12), or existing between members of an intimate family (cf. Rom. 12:10).²⁹ All are one in love, though the members exhibit multiple functions, interests, and abilities, according as the Spirit has given these to them. Therefore, such oneness crosses worldly barriers of nationality (Gal. 3:1-5:15), sex (I Cor. 7), or functional occupation (I Cor. 12; Rom. 12; Gal. 5:13-14).³⁰ This Paul summarizes succinctly in Gal. 3:28, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor

female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." All this is, of course, within the relationships of those in Christ. It is the ethical superstructure built upon the theological foundation of the new age "in Christ" which supplants the old age "in Adam".

We have found that Paul's own commitment to his (God's) gospel was thorough, totally sincere, and selfless, a conclusion very different from that which tends to find in Paul an egotist who was given to self-glorification. We have contended that he practised what he preached, and that in his relations with others, especially in his missionary methods and goals, he carried out the ecumenical principles which he exhorted others to follow.³¹ His whole missionary procedure was ecumenically orientated, even to the team that he gathered about himself for planting the gospel in the succeeding areas of his missionary concern,³² and in his relations with the teams of his neighbouring colleagues dedicated to the same ecumenical gospel.³³ Such teams, even though leadership gravitated towards Paul by reason of intellectual and spiritual powers, functioned, as far as Paul himself was concerned, on the basis of team equality. In accordance with Hebraic psychology Paul desired to withdraw into the team's corporateness in order that the whole might function in solidarity.³⁴ He considered his leadership therefore to be purely functional.

The inherent ecumenism of his methods is borne out in his development of the regions,³⁵ his training of co-workers to develop further and to integrate the churches and regions into wholes and into a united church in Christ,³⁶ hoped for as depicted in Romans, symbolized by the offering,³⁷ argued for in Corinthians, Galatians, and most fully and systematically in Romans. According to Paul's letters, women functioned in the church on the same level as the men,

both sexes helping to promote the gospel.³⁸ All Christians were commissioned to advance the gospel by their example and even by active promotion.³⁹ One must assume that they did so irrespective of race, sex, or class. Slaves, freedmen, officials, and prosperous business men or landowners were gathered in the local communities "in Christ", and these Paul employed in his work and treated with equal love, concern, and respect. Thus the principle that he set forward for others, as in the relations between slave and master in Philemon, or in the gradations between members in I Corinthians (cf. Rom. 12), was carried out by him in his own relations with those working with him, whether on the local level of churches, or more intimately within the missionary teams.⁴⁰

This is especially apparent in Paul's use of terms for these co-workers, e.g., deacons,⁴¹ slaves,⁴² brothers.⁴³ A study of his use of the pronoun "we"⁴⁴ in his letters suggested that missionary planning, preaching, and pastoral care were team activities. Even in his use of travelling companions--on the basis of our study these were seen to be from Asian and not Macedonian churches--the inter-relationship of fellow workers was in terms of the corporate action of the group,⁴⁵ with the emphasis upon team solidarity,⁴⁶ illustrated even in the team's working for a living.⁴⁷ This work seems to have been done not merely for the sake of a living but for the sake of obtaining funds for the implementation of the gospel in the church and for the establishment of the church in the whole oecumene.⁴⁸

Even when pressures from anti-Pauline groups opposed to his ecumenical practices engulfed him, threatened the unity of the church, and tended to force him to take the lead in defence and attack, Paul did so not simply with himself in mind, as the study of

the "I" passages suggest.⁴⁹ It is apparent that his use of "I"--at once both distasteful to him and necessary for him to employ--was in the interests of the defence of the gospel and of his colleagues and not for the sake of his own personal status except in so far as, in the opponents' terms of reference, and so in the eyes of the churches who were watching the outcome and who would be influenced by it, that was necessary for his cause.

From a study of Paul's use of the pronouns "I" and "We" and of the terms used of his co-workers, a certain development of the importance of Paul himself within the ecumenical Gentile mission can be detected, which is not without relation to the question of chronology of his life and letters. Thus a correlation of Paul's use of terms and of his chronology suggests that a new placing of, and reason for, II Cor. 2:14-7:4 in the sequence of Paul's letters, that is, that it belongs within the period of Paul's basic ecumenical mode of writing such as he used in writing his earliest letters, Thessalonians,⁵⁰ should therefore be placed soon after he first left Achaia and not too long after he had begun his work in Ephesus. Once the case had been stated for the ecumenical character of the gospel and the mission, and even for that of apostleship, argued for especially in the post-conference letters which find their climax in Romans, he, in his last letter, Philippians, returned to his earlier way of writing, and refrained, as he had done in his first letters, from arrogating the title of apostle to himself to the exclusion of others who served with him.⁵¹

Correlation of terminology and chronology has also led to a re-examination of Colossians' and Philemon's place within the sequence of letters,⁵² and, in view of Paul's missionary methods and teaching, of their relation to his work in Asia, especially in

Ephesus and the Lycus valley. A comparison of his references to churches and to personnel and of his use of terms and pronouns in other letters with the usage in these letters provide evidence that his role in these regions was primarily one of co-ordinator, teacher, and counsellor of the several teams that turned to him for aid, and suggests a new way of understanding these letters, and a further reason for placing them in the pre-Jerusalem Conference period. For in this light they point to missionary collaboration between many teams working in the Gentile nations, including co-operation in this period between Paul and Barnabas and his team. This would provide an explanation for what was happening in these years in terms of co-operation between different missionary groups, which progressed on a broad scale in a tacit agreement for unity within a vast plan of a mission to the whole world, in which mission Paul was forced into a place of key importance and so became the spokesman for the whole Gentile missionary movement. This development, which was already taking place around Paul, may be reflected at a later stage in the tradition by the author of Acts, who blankets all Gentile missions, including that of Barnabas--a mission that was proceeding simultaneously with Paul's and is recorded in Acts 11:19-15:39⁵³--under the apostleship of Paul, who then becomes the Gentile missionary par excellence.

Paul was also (except where the gospel and its ecumenical character were threatened) tolerant of others' peculiarities, or, as he termed them, weaknesses.⁵⁴ So he became all things to all people that he might gain some people for Christ.⁵⁵ Therefore, when people were in Christ, he tolerated their continuing weaker consciences on matters which to him were now of no essential concern; and for the sake of the unity of the church, he advised all to do likewise

(Rom. 14-15).⁵⁶ To him, Christ was Lord both of the weak and of the strong. This solution to a practical problem as he presents it in Romans could also have grown out of his theology of the stages in the history of creation,⁵⁷ in which the identities and non-essential customs of the previous stages could be contained and tolerated in the higher level in Christ.⁵⁸

This ecumenical fellowship in Christ has a real part to play in the present reign of Christ. This fellowship is not only to be lived in the world but is to be brought to the world.⁵⁹ From a theological perspective, the church is a world-wide fellowship. It therefore must go to the ends of the earth with the proclamation of its gospel. At the same time its own life must demonstrate its ecumenical nature. This was Paul's challenge in Romans to the Jewish Christians, especially to their leaders in their headquarters in Jerusalem who should have influence over them. He also sent it as his challenge to Christians everywhere. It is the indicative of the theology of ecumenism thrust into the imperative of its practice within the fellowship of those now in Christ and of its proclamation to the world. For Paul, this is not a state of relationships existing solely in the present, temporal church but a condition that is ultimately to encompass all humanity. Though for Paul the realization of this is beyond history hidden in the ultimate mysteries of God (Rom. 11:32-36), it nevertheless involves now an immediate and imperative demand of those now already in Christ to implement it in their relations with one another in Christ and to proclaim it abroad until that day when those in Christ, i.e., those in ultimate Man, will comprise all mankind.

Finally, there are some tangential results from this study of Paul's ecumenism. If the chronology argued for in this thesis is

correct which would put Paul's letters and mission back into the earliest stages of the church's development, a re-examination might be called for of the origin and development of the received gospel as being, not independent of and prior to Paul's preaching, but a development of a dialogue in which he himself participated and to which he contributed, a dialogue between those with opposing views of the character of the gospel, its eschatology, and its mission. Paul might then have to be seen as one of the influential formers of the tradition.

Second, because of the power of Paul's ecumenical thinking and mission, and since he was recognized very early by his colleagues, even by Barnabas, as their spokesman, and since the teams of these leaders were interrelated, it could be that by the time the author of Acts received his information Paul had become in tradition the missionary responsible for the whole Gentile mission. This might throw light on the construction of Acts and on the author's selection of material and his presentation of what he has selected. Did he omit reference to other co-operating missions in order to present the whole progress of the gospel to the Gentile regions under the figure of Paul?

ABBREVIATIONS

Analecta Biblica - Analecta Biblica: Investigationes Scientifical in Res Biblicas, Rome.

Arndt-Gingrich - William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.

ATR - Anglican Theological Review, Evanston, Ill.

BA - The Biblical Archaeologist, published by the American Schools of Oriental Research.

BJRL - Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester.

BNTC - Black's New Testament Commentaries.

CAH - The Cambridge Ancient History.

CBQ - Catholic Biblical Quarterly, Washington, D. C.

CNT - Commentaire du Nouveau Testament.

EGT - The Expositor's Greek Testament.

EtB - Études Bibliques.

Ex - The Expositor, London.

ExT - The Expository Times, Edinburgh.

HDB - A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings.

HNT - Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.

HTR - The Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Mass.

IB - The Interpreter's Bible.

ICC - The International Critical Commentary.

IDB - The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible.

JBL - Journal of Biblical Literature, Philadelphia.

JThC - Journal for Theology and the Church, New York.

JTS - The Journal of Theological Studies, Oxford.

JR - The Journal of Religion, Chicago.

Liddell-Scott - H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon.

Loeb - The Loeb Classical Library.

Meyer - Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament,
begründet von H. A. W. Meyer.

MNTC - The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.

Moulton-Milligan - J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of
the Greek Testament.

NovTest - Novum Testamentum, Leiden.

NTD - Das Neue Testament Deutsch.

NLT - The New Testament Library.

NTS - New Testament Studies, Cambridge, England.

RHPR - Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, Strasbourg.

SBT - Studies in Biblical Theology.

StEv - Studia Evangelica, IV, ed. F. L. Cross (Texte und
Untersuchungen, Band 102), Berlin.

StTh - Studia Theologica, Lund.

TDNT - Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. G. Kittel.

ZNW - Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die
Kirche der älteren Kirche, Berlin.

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

¹For a discussion and bibliography of the historical and theological approaches to Pauline studies, see John Coolidge Hurd, Jr., The Origin of I Corinthians (London, 1965), pp. 3-12.

²Cf. Hurd, I Cor., pp. 5-6; idem, "Pauline Chronology and Pauline Theology" in Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox, eds., W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr (Cambridge, England, 1967), pp. 246-48.

³London, 1968.

⁴Notable amongst previous studies is Gustav Hoennicke, Die Chronologie des Lebens des Apostels Paulus (Leipzig, 1903), to which Ogg makes frequent reference. Cf. also Carl Clemen, Paulus: sein Leben und Wirken, 1. Teil (Giessen, 1904); G. G. Findley, "Paul the Apostle", HDB, III (1900), 696b-731a; C. H. Turner, "The Chronology of the New Testament: II. The Apostolic Age", HDB, I (1898), 415b-425a. Also, more recently, G. B. Caird, The Apostolic Age (London, 1955), especially Appendix A, pp. 198-211, and idem, "The Chronology of the NT", IDB (1962), I, 603-607, who says (IDB, I, 603b), "For an absolute chronology we are totally dependent on Acts".

⁵E.g., pp. 8-9, 15, 34-35, 95, 121, 127-28. M. D. Hooker in a review of Ogg's book in The Church Quarterly, II (October, 1969), 168, observes that "the framework of Dr. Ogg's book remains the book of Acts", and that "this is the more surprising since Dr. Ogg himself is prepared to recognize that Acts is not always historically trustworthy". She then asks whether "if this is so, can we use Acts as the basis of this kind of reconstruction?", and concludes "it might have been better to entitle his book 'The Chronology of the Life of Paul according to Acts'."

⁶For the summary of the use of Acts for the usual chronology of Paul, see Hurd, I Cor., pp. 12-19, and of the weaknesses of this, pp. 19-42; see also idem, Pauline Chronology, pp. 225-43. For further illustrations and discussion of the discrepancies, bias, and overriding purpose in the use of source materials by the author of Acts (at least as traditionally read and interpreted) which would seem to limit his reliability as a chronologist of Paul's career, see also Henry J. Cadbury, The Book of Acts in History (London, 1955), pp. 127-28, 142; Martin Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. Heinrich Greeven, trans. Mary Ling (London, 1956), pp. 1-25, 192-214; Hans-Joachim Schoeps, Jewish Christianity: Factional Disputes in the Early Church, trans. Douglas R. A. Hare (Philadelphia, 1969), p. 3; Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, trans. Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn (Oxford, 1971), pp. 112-16. Cf. Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, trans. Frank Clarke (London, 1959), pp. 81-85; see also Norton

Smith, "Pauline Problems: Apropos of J. Munck, 'Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte'", HTR, L (1957), 114-15.

⁷The matters are complicated, but it may be said briefly here with regard to (1) the great famine of 46, that on the fourteen year reckoning of the statements in Galatians it is too early for Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, and since it is usually acknowledged that Paul wrote Galatians and Romans about the same time and towards the end of his career, it does not provide the reason given by Paul in Gal. 2:1-10 for his second visit (cf. Caird, Chronology, p. 606a).

With regard to (2), Claudius's edict, there is a choice between 41 and 49. Only Orosius (5th cent.) gives 49 (the 9th year of Claudius), but "For the period after Augustus they [such late epitomes as, e.g., Orosius's Historiae adversus Paganos] merely repeat monotonously the tradition that was finally fixed after the time of Tacitus and Suetonius" (M. P. Charlesworth, "Appendix: The Literary Authorities for Roman History", CAH, X, 873-74).

With regard to (3), the accession of Festus, possible dates are 55, 56, or up to 59 or even up to 60 or 61. The main objections to an early date are on the one hand the long list of events in Felix's procuratorship related by Josephus after he has reported the accession of Nero, and on the other hand the fact that Josephus only gives two short paragraphs to the procuratorship of Festus. But in themselves these are insufficient grounds for doubting the early date. For Josephus in this section is first dealing with Felix's appointment, then with the intrigue with which he was involved in his court circle, which then leads Josephus to the much greater intrigues in the Imperial household; only then does he return to Judaeian matters. And because of the manner in which he deals with these matters in blocks and of the way he introduces affairs in Judaea, it appears that he is going back to the beginning of Felix's procuratorship in order to pick up the thread of the narrative dealing with Felix's relations with Judaea, for he has said nothing about them since noting his appointment. The long list of atrocities of Felix seem to be the point of his narrating them at this point, since they lead up to the circumstances surrounding his termination of office and the Jews' legation to Rome to accuse him before Nero. That Josephus says so little about Festus' term of office fits well with his purpose in writing, since Festus is said to have put an end to crimes and atrocities that were being committed by brigands and those in high places under Felix. On the whole other events in the procuratorship of either were, for Josephus, beside the point (cf. Caird, Apostolic Age, pp. 33-34).

⁸See Donald W. Riddle, Paul, Man of Conflict: A Modern Biographical Sketch (Nashville, 1940), esp. pp. 13-15; John Knox, "'Fourteen Years Later': A Note on the Pauline Chronology", JR, XVI (1936), 341-49, "The Pauline Chronology", JBL, LVIII (1939), 15-29, Chapters in a Life of Paul (New York, 1950; London, 1954). For a description of the principles underlying the work of Riddle and Knox and of the reactions of scholars to them, see Hurd, Pauline Chronology, pp. 225-48. Hurd emphasizes that the main issue is a methodological one.

⁹I Cor., see esp. pp. 3-42.

¹⁰Charles Buck and Greer Taylor, Saint Paul: A Study of the Development of His Thought (New York, 1969), pp. 3-175; see their statement of method, pp. 5-9. See also Charles H. Buck, Jr., "The Collection for the Saints", HTR, XLIII (1950), 1-29.

¹¹M. J. Suggs, "Concerning the Date of Paul's Macedonian Ministry", NovTest, IV (1960), 60-68.

¹²J. Munck, Salvation of Mankind, see esp. pp. 81-85.

¹³Günther Bornkamm, Paul, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (London, 1971); see esp. pp. xiv-xxviii for a description of his methodology.

¹⁴Morton Scott Enslin, Reapproaching Paul (Philadelphia, 1972); see esp. pp. 17-31.

¹⁵Buck and Taylor, op. cit., pp. 179-215.

¹⁶Note his reliance upon Acts, I Cor., pp. 240-70.

¹⁷Buck and Taylor, op. cit., cf. pp. 9, 19; see also F. F. Bruce, "The Epistles of Paul", Peake's Commentary on the Bible, Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley, eds. (London, 1962), pp. 928-30. For a list of modern scholars who in one way or another appeal to theological development, see Hurd, I Cor., p. 8, n. 3; cf. also p. 11, n. 1; for those against this method, see p. 10, n. 2. The letters are so occasional (cf. Robert M. Grant, A Historical Introduction to the New Testament [London, 1963], p. 173) and are written for such specific situations by one who was not intending to be read as a systematic theologian but as an active field missionary, that even after first establishing (on other grounds) a reliable sequence of letters, it is doubtful whether any development can be found that will not reflect a bias or a purely accidental and so false picture of an evolution of thought. For a more detailed criticism of Buck and Taylor's methodology see John Koenig's review of their book in Union Seminary Quarterly Review, XXV (Spring, 1970), 368-71; also see Ernest Best, A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, BNTC (London, 1972), pp. 12-13. Cf. Munck, op. cit., p. 85, and Smith, op. cit., pp. 114-15.

¹⁸Op. cit., pp. 23-30.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 25-27. Yet it should be noted that their dating of II Cor. 1-9 rests for evidence of the historical situation upon II Cor. 2:12-13 and 7:5 ff., so without the disputed section 2:14-7:4 upon which their proof of theological development in Paul largely depends. Their linking II Cor. 3 (p. 29) with Pentecost is plausible, but that it refers to the same year as the Passover mentioned in I Cor. 5:7-8 and so is to be dated with the rest of II Cor. 1-9, is questionable. II Cor. 2:14-7:4 will be discussed in later chapters of this thesis.

²⁰Paul, pp. xiv-xxviii, especially pp. xv-xxi. Bornkamm claims that he uses Acts very critically as a secondary source (and undoubtedly does); but though this perhaps helps to paint a much fuller and more detailed portrait of Paul, the question must be asked, what standards are to be used, other than subtly subjective

ones, in being critical in one's work unless there are at least allusions in Paul's letters that give weight to the evidence. Such a dependence upon Acts, even though seemingly critical, leads Bornkamm to a picture of Paul as hurriedly pushing his missionary work (pp. 54-55; cf. also the dependence of his chronology upon Acts, e.g., see pp. 26-52), which is quite at variance with that drawn from the method used in this present study. The more Acts is used where Paul is silent, the less probability that the results are accurate. This is tacitly admitted by Bornkamm himself, see p. xxi. Cf. Buck and Taylor, op. cit., p. 6. Others, e.g., A. S. Geyser, "Paul, The Apostolic Decree and the Liberals in Corinth" in Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii, eds. J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 124-38, S. Deckx, "Chronologie de la vie de Saint Paul, depuis sa conversion jusqu'à son séjour à Rome", NovTest, XIII (1971), 261-304, and Buck, Collection, pp. 1-29 (cf. also Buck and Taylor, op. cit., especially pp. 179-260; and Enslin, Paul, passim), while starting from the historical situation of the epistles, endeavour nevertheless to harmonize Acts and Paul, often by correcting Acts, subtly making further attempts to fit Paul into its chronology. Cf. also Munck, op. cit., pp. 78-81, who, though accepting the secondary nature of Acts, nevertheless uses it as a reliable primary source where Paul is silent, which is a questionable procedure; see Smith's reply, op. cit., pp. 128-29. Knox, Chapters, p. 79, also assumes the reliability of Acts to some degree in this way; but see Suggs, Macedonian Ministry, pp. 60-68, for arguments against such reliance.

²¹Pauline Chronology, pp. 243 ff.

²²Caird, Chronology, p. 606a, and Thomas H. Campbell, "Paul's 'Missionary Journeys' as Reflected in His Letters", JBL, LXXIV (June, 1955), 80-87, have taken exception to Knox's method, accusing him of not taking Acts seriously (Campbell, p. 80). Though Campbell admits that the letters must be taken as the primary sources, that "Acts is at best a secondary source except . . . where the author is writing as an eye-witness or using the journal of an eye-witness", that "Acts exhibits certain tendencies which Knox mentions", and that "Acts by no means tells the whole story of Paul's career", he nevertheless sets out to prove that "if all the evidence found in Paul's letters is taken seriously, the main outlines of the progress of his missionary work from province to province can be established", and that "the resulting outline will be much more nearly in harmony with the Acts account than the conclusions of Riddle and Knox would lead one to believe". For a criticism of Campbell's position and method, see Hurd, Pauline Chronology, pp. 228-31.

²³See Werner Georg Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr., NTL (London, 1966), pp. 177-78.

²⁴For a history of the criticism, see B. Rigaux, Saint Paul: Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniens, EtB (Paris, 1956), pp. 124-52. Majority opinion today supports its inclusion; see Rigaux, especially pp. 131-32, also Kümmel, op. cit., pp. 187-90.

²⁵See Kümmel, op. cit., pp. 240-44. See also John Knox, "Philemon and the Authenticity of Colossians", JR, XVIII (1938),

146, n. 2; Ed Parish Sanders, "Literary Dependence in Colossians", *JBL*, LXXXV (1966), 28-45; C. F. D. Moule, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon: An Introduction and Commentary, Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge, England, 1962), pp. 13-14; J. L. Houlden, Paul's Letters from Prison: Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians, The Pelican New Testament Commentaries (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 1970), pp. 134-39. For the view that Colossians is completely the work of a later Pauline school, see Eduard Lohse, "Pauline Theology in the Letter to the Colossians", *NTS*, XV (1968-1969), 211-20, also *idem*, Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, trans. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris, ed. Helmut Koester, Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 84-91, 177-83. For this thesis the core of Colossians which deals with the historical situations and relationships is accepted as authentic.

²⁶See Cadbury, op. cit., pp. 4, 34-35, 41, 44, 66.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

¹Cf. Ragnar Bring, "Paul and the Old Testament: A Study of the ideas of Election, Faith and Law in Paul, with special references to Romans 9:30-10:30", *StTh*, XXV (1971), 57-60; L. Corfaux, Christ in the Theology of St. Paul, trans. Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (London, 1959), pp. 31-96.

²See W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology (2d ed.; London, 1955); E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Edinburgh, 1957); Frederick G. Grant, Ancient Judaism and the New Testament (2d ed.; Edinburgh, 1960), pp. 164-65; *idem*, Roman Hellenism and the New Testament (Edinburgh, 1962), pp. 140-47. These note traces of Hellenistic thought, but agree that Paul came chiefly from a strict, Old Testament, Judaistic background. So, too, Albert Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. William Montgomery (2d ed.; London, 1953), p. 8. This conclusion has been considerably strengthened by recent studies of the Dead Sea Scrolls; see in The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. Krister Stendahl (New York, 1957), articles by Stendahl, "The Scrolls and the New Testament: An Introduction and a Perspective", p. 5, Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research Into the Beginnings of Christianity", p. 19, W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit", p. 182. See also Sherman E. Johnson, "Paul and the Manual of Discipline", *HTR*, XLVIII (1955), 165. From the point of view of language and thought forms see Bédé Rigaux, Saint Paul et ses Lettres: État de la question, *Studia Neotestamentica, Subsidia II* (Paris, 1962), p. 180; cf. Ludwig Köhler, Hebrew Man, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (London, 1956), *passim*. Whatever likeness to or knowledge of Greek or Roman philosophers or their teachings that Paul may have had, may well have come from knowledge gained in dialogue with pagan and Christian Gentiles after his conversion and during his missionary campaigns, for it was his policy to "become all things to all men" (I Cor. 9:22). See J. N. Sevenster, Paul and Seneca, *Supplements to NovTest*, IV (Leiden, 1961), and Norman Wentworth

DeWitt, St. Paul and Epicurus (Minneapolis, 1954). The above tends to corroborate the thesis (made on the basis of a study of Acts) of W. C. van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth, trans. George Ogg (London, 1962), passim, that Paul moved from Tarsus while a small child and was reared and educated in Jerusalem away from Hellenistic influence.

³See Peter Dalbert, Die Theologie der Hellenistisch-Jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus, Theologische Forschung, Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre, IV (Hamburg, 1954), e.g., pp. 23-26, 124-25, 130.

⁴Edmond Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock (London, 1958), pp. 201-209.

⁵For references to and discussion of the literature of the Diaspora, see Dalbert, op. cit., and Robert H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times: With an Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York, 1949), pp. 166-230, note especially, pp. 186-87.

⁶Cf. D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Oxford, 1970), p. 233, who distinguishes two usages of the term, "eschatology", 1) teachings about "end-things", and 2) "qualitative", i.e., an event in time which is the "work of God". But it may be observed that it is qualitative not only in the sense that God is acting in the event but also because in that work the occurrences belonging to end-time are already breaking into time and determining the significance of the present. The teleological is visible and experienced now, giving existence the stamp of the eschatological or end-things. On election see H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London, 1950), passim.

⁷See James Muilenburg, The Way of Israel: Biblical Faith and Ethics, Religious Perspectives, V (New York, 1961; London, 1962), pp. 144-45; Ernst Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology", JThC, VI (1969), 33; and John G. Gibbs, Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology, Supplements to NovTest, XXVI (Leiden, 1971), pp. 140-45.

⁸See Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. J. A. Baker, The Old Testament Library (2 vols.; London, 1961-1967), II, 343-44. Utter contempt was often shown toward the Gentiles (Ecclus. 50:25-26; Jub. 22:16; 23:24; 29:11; Ps. Sol. 1:1; 2:1-2; 7:2; I En. 89-90:27; Wisd. 12:10-11; 13:1; Judith 12:2; cf. I Macc. 5). Yet see Sheldon H. Blank, "Studies in Post-Exilic Universalism", Hebrew Union College Annual, XI (1936), 159-91, especially pp. 171-74, and Rolland E. Wolfe, "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve", Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LIII (1935), 90-129, especially sections III and IV. Isaiah 56-66 loses much of the colour of contempt when read in the light of 61:6 (the nations are wealthy), 61:6-9 (Israel, the world's priests, share in the world's economy), 61:10-11 and 62:1-2 (Israel rejoices; she is the means of universal salvation in history). See also Is. 42:6-8; 2:3. Cf. Claus Westermann, Isaiah 40-66: A commentary, trans. David M. G. Stalker, The Old Testament Library (London, 1969), pp. 99-100; Dalbert, op. cit., p. 18.

⁹Cf. Joachim Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, trans. S. H. Hooke, SBT, No. 24 (London, 1958), pp. 11-19.

¹⁰Cf. George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The age of the Tannaim (3 vols.; Cambridge, Mass., 1927-1930), I, 230, 326-28; II, 373-74; also Ch. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke, The History of Civilization (London, 1939), pp. 154-57; and Muilenburg, op. cit., p. 146. See also Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 6-9. But see Dalbert, op. cit., pp. 8-9 on the Maccabean literature. Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, in his article on "ἀπόστολος", TDNT, I, 414-20, disclaims any evidence of an authorized mission of Judaism at the time of the early New Testament, though there were indeed many Jewish missionaries acting on a private basis (cf. Dalbert, p. 22), but not as authorized apostles of the community. So, he says, in the sense of one who was regularly "called to preach the religion of his fathers", Paul cannot be thought of as an authorized missionary of Judaism before his conversion. In fact, "there were no authorized missionaries in Judaism prior to 70 A.D."

¹¹Cf. Is. 42:4a; 45:8, 18-19, 22-23; 46:10; also Is. 42:4b; 51:5; Jer. 12:4, 11; Ps. 96:11-13.

¹²See Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 55-75, especially 70-71; also see C. F. Evans, "'I Will Go Before You into Galilee'", JTS, N.S., V (1954), 7-8.

¹³R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (2 vols.; Oxford, 1913), II, 582-84, 597-98; see Guignebert, op. cit., pp. 134-38.

¹⁴Jacob, Theology, pp. 327-42.

¹⁵Cf. Phil. 3:12. See Munck, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 22-23; H. J. Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, trans. Harold Knight (London, 1961), pp. 54-55; Ellis, Paul's Use of the O.T., p. 149; Johannes Weiss, Paul and Jesus, trans. H. J. Chaytor, Harper's Library of Living Thought (London, 1909), pp. 26-27; Adolf Deissmann, Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. William E. Wilson (2d ed., rev.; London, 1926), pp. 128-30; C. F. D. Moule, The Phenomenon of the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Implications of Certain Features of the New Testament, SBT, 2d Ser., No. 1 (London, 1967), pp. 14, 20, 93-94; and for a fuller treatment, see C. F. Evans, Resurrection and the New Testament, SBT, 2d Ser., No. 12 (London, 1970), pp. 1-4, 41-56, ch. 3, also appendix, pp. 170-83; David Michael Stanley, Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, Analecta Biblica, 13 (1961); Eduard Schweizer, Jesus, trans. David E. Green, NTL (London, 1971), pp. 52-122; and Jack T. Sanders, The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, No. 15 (Cambridge, England, 1971), passim.

¹⁶See S. Mowinkel, He that Cometh, trans. G. W. Anderson (Oxford, 1956), pp. 420-37; Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 49, 287-88; Rudolph Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion, trans. Floyd V. Filson and Bertram

Lee-Woolf, Lutterworth Library, IX (rev. ed.; London, 1943), pp. 389-92. See also Morna D. Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the background of the term "Son of Man" and its use in St. Mark's Gospel (London, 1967), pp. 11-74, for a review and study of this background and literature pertaining to it. For an early creation myth see Alexander Heidel, The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of the Creation (2d ed.; Chicago and London, 1951), note especially, pp. 42-43, Enuma Elish Tablet IV, 135-46; Tablet VI, 29-33; cf. VI, 1-7.

¹⁷See Jean Hering, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London, 1962), pp. 68-71. It is to be noted that while Christ is the intermediary in creation, it is still God who is the author of creation, in keeping with Hebrew thought; cf. Richard N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity, SBT, 2d Ser., No. 17 (London, 1970), pp. 135-36.

¹⁸See Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 372 and nn.; also Bring, Paul, pp. 40-41; and Ernst Käsemann, Perspectives on Paul, NTL (London, 1971), p. 112. Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "'To Know Him and the Power of His Resurrection' (Phil. 3.10)" in Mélanges Bibliques: en hommage au R. P. Bédard Rigaux, Albert Descamps et R. P. André (Gembloux, 1970), pp. 415-25. This brings to full flower the idea of the teleological in the protological, for here the significant teleological fact is the eschatological Man, first in creation because he is the reason for and the climactic goal of all creation, the great teleological secret that at last God the Creator has been able to reveal to man. This is also the significance of the revelation and of the mission in Gal. 1:15-16.

¹⁹Cf. II Esd. 12:32; also I En. 39:6-7; 41:9; 48:2, 6-7; 51:3. On I En. 48:2, 3, 6, see Hooker, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

²⁰See C. K. Barrett, From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology (London, 1962), pp. 97-99; Hering, I Cor., pp. 165-66; Emil Brunner, The Letter to the Romans: A Commentary, trans. H. A. Kennedy (London, 1959), pp. 43-47; C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, MNTC (London, 1932), pp. 78-83; Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, p. 41; Russell Phillip Shedd, Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1964), pp. 107-109. This is, of course, semitic solidarity or corporate being. See Shedd, pp. 5, 10-12, 26-38; Johs. Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture (4 vols.; London, 1926-1940), I-II, 46-60, 263, 265-79; Davies, op. cit., pp. 207-208; and Ellis, Paul's Use of the O.T., pp. 58-60.

²¹Cf. Rom. 8:9. See W. David Stacey, The Pauline View of Man: In Relation to its Judaic and Hellenistic Background (London, 1956), pp. 128-45.

²²See, e.g., II Esd. 7; cf. Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 267-79, 327, 352; Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 287-98, idem, Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come, JBL Monograph Series, VII (Philadelphia, 1952), pp. 81-82. For a discussion of this problem in connection with the final resurrection, see Evans, Resurrection, pp. 1-40.

²³Cf. Jean Héring, "Saint Paul a-t-il enseigné deux résurrections?", RHPR, XII (1932), 312; also A. Q. Morton and James McLeman, Paul, the Man and the Myth: A Study in the Authorship of Greek Prose (London, 1966), pp. 125-26; and Ferdinand Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity, trans. Harold Knight and George Ogg, Lutterworth Library (London, 1969), pp. 249-50. Cf. Héring, I Cor., pp. 88-90; also Paul S. Minear, "Christian Eschatology and Historical Methodology" in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann: zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954, Beihefte zur ZNW, XXI (Berlin, 1954), p. 20; Ernst Fuchs, "On the Task of a Christian Theology", JThC, VI (1969), 83.

²⁴Contra Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 225-26, who has it as Moses' act; see Jean Héring, The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians, trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London, 1967), pp. 21-22; and Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, ICC (Edinburgh, 1915), pp. 77-83; and J.-F. Collange, Enigmes de la Deuxieme Epitre de Paul aux Corinthiens: Etude Exegetique de 2 Cor. 2:14-7:4, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, XVIII (Cambridge, England, 1972), pp. 48-55. Ex. 34:27-28 is the only place where Moses writes the law on the tablets of stone. In every other passage, God writes it. On $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\ \upsilon\phi'\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ see Plummer, p. 81. But hardly would one write one's own letter of commendation even as an amanuensis. The heart and the method of writing point to an act beyond Paul, i.e., to Christ. On $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ or $\upsilon\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$, see ch. 4, n. 57.

²⁵See C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, BNTC (London, 1968), pp. 71-72; Héring, I Cor., pp. 16-18; and Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, trans. Kendrick Grobel (2 vols.; London, 1952-1955), I, 175; but see Ralph P. Martin, Carmen Christi: Philippians 11.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, IV (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 217-28, on the question of Phil. 2:1-11 referring to the overthrow of cosmic powers. On Christ's exaltation as expressed in Phil. 2:9-11, see Martin, pp. 229-70; also cf. J. A. Sanders, "Dissenting Deities and Philippians 2:1-11", JBL, LXXXVIII (1969), 283; and Käsemann, Beginnings, pp. 43-44.

²⁶Contra J. Munck, "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament", JTS, N.S., II (1951), 7; see James Calvin De Young, Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology (Kampen, 1960), pp. 119-20, 124-26, 131-34. On the present nature of Christ's kingdom for Paul, cf. Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, p. 113.

²⁷See Günther Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience, trans. Paul L. Hammer, NTL (London, 1969), pp. 22-25. Cf. also G. H. C. MacGregor, "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought", NIS, I (1954-1955), 24-25.

²⁸See Rom. 1:5; 15:17-18; I Cor. 1:28; 2:4-5; II Cor. 5:17-20; 6:1; 10:3-6; cf. Floyd V. Filson, "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: Introduction and Exegesis", IB, X (1953), 383-85; also

Rigaux, Thess., pp. 153-70, 460, 472-76.

²⁹Cf. John Knox, "The Epistle to the Romans: Introduction and Exegesis", IB, IX (1954), 513-14, 518-22; cf. also Barrett, From First Adam, pp. 98-99. See also John G. Gager, Jr., "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language", JBL, LXXXIX (1970), 328-29; Ernst Käsemann, "On the Topic of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic", JThC, VI (1969), 130-33.

³⁰"Le caractère eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de S. Paul: Étude sur le κατέχων (-ων) de 2. Thess. 2:6-7", RHPR, XVI (1936), 210-45; Munck, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 36-42, and further developed, pp. 42-68.

³¹"'Mystery' in the theology of Saint Paul and its parallels at Qumran", in Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, ed., Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis (London, 1968), pp. 132-58. See also John Knox, "Romans 15:14-33 and Paul's Conception of His Apostolic Mission", JBL, LXXXIII (1964), 8; and Peter Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, X (Cambridge, England, 1969), pp. 108-11.

³²For a full discussion of these questions, see Rigaux, Thess., pp. 196-280, especially pp. 259-80, and for a distinctive viewpoint interpreting the κατέχων as the Roman State, see Otto Betz, "Der Katechon", NTS, IX (1962-1963), 276-91, especially pp. 284-89. For a more recent critical discussion of the problems connected with the identification of the κατέχων (-ων) and the interrelation of the various terms in II Thess. 2, see Best, Thess., pp. 273-310, especially pp. 295-310.

³³C. H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development", BJRL, XVIII (1934) [republished in idem, New Testament Studies (Manchester, 1953), pp. 83-128], 93-98, rejects the idea that Paul kept his earlier expectancy of an imminent Parousia and claims that in later letters, especially Romans and the "Roman" imprisonment epistles, this had faded into non-existence. Cf. also Bruce, Epistles of Paul, pp. 928-29. But, as has been indicated, this is hard to see in the face of direct statements referring to its imminent arrival. See also Schoeps, Paul, pp. 100-108, who thinks that Paul reckoned with an interim between the resurrection and the Parousia of 40 years at most. If so, since all his letters are written within that period, there would be no cause to change his expectancy.

³⁴The method used by Hurd, I Cor., pp. 273-88, to arrive at Paul's first preaching in Corinth from remarks made in I Corinthians and I and II Thessalonians, and from that to show a development of eschatological thought (pp. 282-87), is precariously built upon assumptions which do not adequately take into consideration historical situations that gave rise to the letters, especially to I Corinthians, and which depend upon preconceived ideas of what is early crudity of thought and what is later refinement of thought, rather than of what may be relevant answers to particular problems arising from concrete situations without necessarily altering original concepts, which we do not have in complete form in any one letter.

³⁵See A. L. Moore, The Parousia in the New Testament, Supplements to NovTest, XIII (Leiden, 1966), pp. 103-25; i.e., the Parousia is soon but the time is not delimited. It would seem, therefore, that related questions, such as death and resurrection (cf. Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, p. 317), do not necessarily cancel the concept of the imminence of the Parousia. Cf. William Baird, "Pauline Eschatology in Hermeneutical Perspective", NTS, XVII (1970-1971), 323-27.

³⁶Cf. Bring, Paul, pp. 44-48; C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology (London, 1952), pp. 41-43.

³⁷So C. H. Dodd, "The Historical Problem of the Death of Jesus" in idem, More New Testament Studies (Manchester, 1968), pp. 84-100.

³⁸See Josef Blinzler, "The Jewish Punishment of Stoning in the New Testament Period" in The Trial of Jesus: Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule, ed. Ernst Bammel, SBT, 2d Ser., No. 13 (London, 1970), pp. 148-50. See Babylonian Talmud: Sanhedrin, vi, 42b-49a, especially 43a-46a.

³⁹Dodd, Death of Jesus, pp. 84-87.

⁴⁰See C. K. Barrett, "Christianity at Corinth", BJRL, XLVI (1963-1964), 279-80; MacGregor, Principalities, pp. 22-24; Bo Reicke, "The Law and this World According to Paul: Some thoughts concerning Gal. 4:1-11", JBL, LXX (1951), 269-70.

⁴¹Cf. Nils Alstrup Dahl, "The Atonement--an Adequate Reward for the Akedah? (Ro 8:32)" in Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black, eds. E. Earle Ellis, Max Wilcox (Edinburgh, 1969), p. 23; F. F. Bruce, "Galatian Problems 3. The 'Other' Gospel", BJRL, LIII (1970-1971), 264.

⁴²This is not to deny the presence of a false accusation prompting this remark. Indeed, some opponents may have misconstrued his policy, referred to in I Cor. 7:18-20, to mean this. Cf. Ernest DeWitt Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, ICC (1921), pp. 269-90, especially pp. 286-88.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

¹For the origin and presence of the Christian church in these regions, see the discussion in Walter Schmithals, Paul and James, trans. Dorothea M. Barton, SBT, No. 46 (London, 1965), pp. 16-37.

²Contra Jack T. Sanders, "Paul's 'Autobiographical' Statements in Galatians 1 - 2", JBL, LXXXV (1966), 335-43. Cf. F. F. Bruce, "Galatian Problems 1. Autobiographical Data", BJRL, LI (1968-1969), 296.

³So Dockx, Chronologie, p. 261 including n. 1, and many

others. Some shorten this to 11 years, thinking that Paul refers back each time to the year of his conversion; cf. Knox, Chapters, pp. 77-78. In accordance with the ancient method of numbering a fraction of a year as a year, the totals given may need to be reduced by up to a year, or possibly a fraction more; cf. C. K. Barrett, "Titus" in Neotestamentica, eds. Ellis, Wilcox, p. 3, n. 13.

⁴Chapters, pp. 58-60; Fourteen Years, pp. 344-45.

⁵Macedonian Ministry, passim.

⁶See Arndt-Gingrich, p. 227.

⁷Cf. Moulton-Milligan, p. 186.

⁸Life of Paul, p. 38.

⁹Later, Ogg notes (p. 118) that "In Acts there is no detailed report of a founding of churches in Syria and Cilicia". Then, presumably to indicate that Paul founded them, he adds, "yet their existence is assumed in Acts 15:41", which, of course, proves nothing as far as Paul's relation to these churches is concerned; and, indeed, such silence on the part of Acts, would seem strange if Paul--Acts' hero--had been responsible for most of the work done there for 14 years.

Robert E. Osborne, "St. Paul's Silent Years", JBL, LXXXIV (March, 1965), 64, while critical of Knox's use of Acts and his method of eliminating the silent years (cf. George Ogg, "A New Chronology of Saint Paul's Life", ExT, LXIV [1953], 120-23), nevertheless admits that Acts is deficient in recounting all the events in Paul's career (op. cit., passim), but goes on to fill in the gaps left by the silent years. But if Paul by his own words in Gal. 1:21-2:1 is limited to the regions of Syria and Cilicia (so the Acts-chronologists), can we find in Acts demonstrable proof that Paul did go outside these regions during these silent years, even as far as North Galatia and Crete, as Osborne attempts to do for the sake of his own a priori assumption that such can be found in Acts? If so, then why cannot others, such as Knox and Suggs, who are not using the secondary source, Acts, deduce from Paul's own words (a primary source) that he had gone on to Macedonia and Achaia? From the basis upon which Osborne argues, it follows that he also is one who assumes that the εἰς in Gal. 1:21 is not a preposition implying "rest in" but rather "direction of travel".

Campbell, Paul's 'Missionary Journeys', p. 82, erroneously demands that Paul "tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth" concerning all that happened for 14 years, if, as Knox claims, he is under oath. But such a recounting would be unrelated to Paul's point here, which was simply that he had nothing to do with Jerusalem in between the visits, and that even on these visits the Jerusalem apostles added nothing to his gospel. The mention, therefore, of Syria and Cilicia was enough; anything else would have been understood by his readers who knew the rest. That all the meetings occurred before the Galatian mission (so Caird, Chronology, p. 605a) is by no means necessarily the case. Other factors need to be considered, such as the number of Paul's visits to Galatia, and the timing and nature of the opposition in relation to these visits, and Paul's attendance at the Jerusalem Conference.

¹⁰Knox, Chapters, p. 59.

¹¹See Ferdinand Hahn, Mission in the New Testament, trans. Frank Clarke, SBT, No. 47 (London, 1965), pp. 47-77.

¹²TDNT, I, 431-32; also, Schmithals, Paul and James, p. 34, n. 71; and Burnett Hillman Streeter, The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry (London, 1929), pp. 34-36; cf. Evans, Into Galilee, pp. 15-17.

¹³Op. cit., pp. 66-67. Cf. also Knox, Chapters, pp. 58-60; and Johannes Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, completed by Rudolf Knopf, trans. by four friends, ed. Frederick C. Grant (2 vols.; London, 1937), I, 204.

¹⁴Cf. Knox, Chapters, pp. 59, 72-73, and Buck and Taylor, Saint Paul, p. 165.

¹⁵For a suggestion, see pp. 55-56, including n. 48, and pp. 99-100 of this study.

¹⁶For discussions dealing with pertinent questions concerning Claudius' edict, see Knox, Chapters, pp. 82-83, Cadbury, Acts in History, pp. 115-116, and n. 13, p. 134, Kirsopp Lake, "The Chronology of Acts", in The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles, eds., F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (5 vols.; London, 1920-1933), V, 459, Haenchen, Acts, p. 65, W. Marxsen, Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to its Problems, trans. G. Buswell (Oxford, 1968), pp. 98-100, G. Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 104-11, and Sherman E. Johnson, "Notes and Comments", ATR, XXIII (1941), 174-75. Knox argues for an early dating of the edict, i.e., 41 (see also his n. 6, p. 83; cf. Cadbury, loc. cit.); Marxsen, Lake, Haenchen, and Ogg, following Acts, date the edict late, i.e., 49 or 50, though Lake, like Knox, observes that external sources force an early dating, i.e., 41, and Haenchen questions its chronological value, while Ogg, p. 103, relying upon Orosius' dating of the edict in the 9th year of Claudius, notes its harmony with his Acts' chronology. Marxsen raises the question whether Prisca and Aquila were non-Christians or Christians at the time of their arrival in Corinth. If one follows the Acts account, then, if they were non-Christians and Aquila was a Jew, they would hardly have been friendly with Paul; and if Christians, then Paul would have had to be in Corinth at the same time as or even earlier than they were for his claims to be valid. Some argue that this edict was unenforceable (see Knox, Chapters, p. 82, n. 5; cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 65) and that few if any Jews left Rome because of it. On this basis, whatever the date of the edict, there is the possibility that Prisca and Aquila travelled for reasons other than an order of expulsion; they may have travelled for purely business reasons. One should note the strategic commercial centres with which they were connected: Rome, Corinth, and Ephesus.

¹⁷Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 28-30, argues rightly for an early dating of Paul's conversion. He includes a reference to Rom. 16:7 as proving that there were but few converts before Paul, and argues against those who demand a late date because there was an established church in Damascus. The presence of Christians there early is

explicable, he says, on other grounds than that of a developed missionary program. But likewise, though inversely, it can be argued that Paul had to be in Achaia early before other Christians began work there. Thus it is not on the basis of Gal. 1:21 but of other inferences to be gathered from Paul's own statements that we can maintain that Paul could not have lingered long in Syria and Cilicia but had to move on to Macedonia and Achaia. It is hard to escape the conclusion that work in Achaia had to be early in Paul's career and not 14 years later, if his statements in I Cor. 1:16 and 16:15 are to ring true. Consequently, it seems difficult to separate chapter 2 of Galatians from chapter 1 in order to squeeze in the famine visit of Acts 11:30; 12:25, which would have had to take place ca. 46. This seems hardly feasible in the story Paul tells in Galatians 1 and 2, the whole purpose of which was to show that he was entirely independent of the apostles in Jerusalem for the whole 14 years. But in addition, if he had remained in Syria and Cilicia even until 46 it becomes difficult for Paul to have been the first Christian to work in Achaia and for the Macedonians to be among the first fruits of the gospel.

¹⁸Macedonian Ministry, pp. 60-68.

¹⁹Contra Ernst Lohmeyer, Der Brief an die Philipper, Meyer, Neunte Abteilung (1) (13. Aufl.; Göttingen, 1964), p. 2, who, as is general, interprets these words according to the chronology of Acts. Bornkamm, Experience, pp. 14-15, following Acts, takes Phil. 4:15 as Paul's reference to "a new beginning occurring here". But Paul says nothing about any new beginning; he refers to it simply as the beginning.

²⁰For a discussion of the readings, see Rigaux, Thess., pp. 65-66, 682-84, and Suggs, op. cit., pp. 63-66. Cf. E. Earle Ellis, "Paul and His Co-Workers", NTS, XVII (1970-1971), 450, including n. 3. Ellis, preferring "first fruits", rightly argues (if his choice is correct) that as such they consecrate the whole (see the discussion of the "offering of the first-fruits" in Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, trans. John McHugh [2d ed.; London, 1965], pp. 490-91, 493, the latter more truly descriptive of the feast of the "first-fruits"). As first-fruits, however, it corresponds more closely to A. von Harnack's view of "first converts" (see idem, "Das problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs", in Sitzungsberichten der Königlich Preussisch Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch historisch Klasse [Berlin, 1910], pp. 575-576), as first of the harvest, i.e., the harvest of converts to Christ, than to Ellis' view of Levite consecration in the place of the first-born. There is no indication in II Thess. 2:13 that Paul intended (according to the reading, "first-fruits") to set up or to recognize a new Levite cast within the church. The Levites were instead of the first-born (cf. Num. 8:16-18; see de Vaux, p. 360), whereas these in II Thess. 2:13 are the first-born. There is no intimation of representation here; the analogy is rather to the harvest, not to status groups. But with either reading, "first-fruits" or "from the beginning", the time reference is not merely to the beginning of Paul's work in Macedonia but to the beginning of his missionary career (so Suggs, loc. cit.). Cf. II Thess. 2:13 (if reading "first-fruits") with I Cor. 16:15. In the latter, the time element in "first-fruits" is restricted to Achaia; in II Thess. 2:13,

there is no restriction of place, which would again indicate that Paul had in mind the "first-fruits" of his entire missionary career.

²¹Much is usually said about the mental confusion caused to Paul and to the Thessalonians by the fact of Christians dying between Paul's visit and the writing of I Thessalonians. But if one dates I Thessalonians where all have to do who follow Acts, i.e., in the early fifties, then it seems strange that neither Paul nor the Thessalonians had up to that time been aware that death had inevitably already struck down many Christians in the twenty years or more which had elapsed since the crucifixion (indeed, even within the much shorter time allowed by the chronology suggested in this study). This supposed eschatological problem would alone point to a date for I and II Thessalonians in the very earliest stages of the beginnings of the Christian movement.

²²See Plummer, II Cor., p. 333, and for historical background, see M. P. Charlesworth, "Tiberius", CAH, X, p. 649, and idem, "Gaius and Claudius", CAH, X, pp. 660-62; cf. also Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 22-23, and Hoennicke, Chronologie, pp. 40-42.

²³Cf. Knox, Pauline Chronology, p. 19, n. 9, and Ogg, loc. cit. (see also G. Ogg, "Chronology of the New Testament" in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, eds. Black and Rowley [London, 1962], p. 730), for early dating.

²⁴According to Acts 15:40-16:9, when Paul came to Troas opposite Macedonia, it was there that he received his call, "Come over to Macedonia and help us." The impression gained from this memory-fragment is that Paul had been looking for an opening, and that at last the opportunity came. So, with Timothy and Silas (=Silvanus, cf. Cadbury, Acts in History, pp. 69-71, 107, n. 11), he went directly across to Macedonia. Those following the traditional chronological scheme based upon Acts (e.g., Haenchen, Acts, pp. 484-87; Martin Dibelius, Paul, edited and completed by Werner Georg Kummel, trans. Frank Clarke [London, 1953], pp. 74-76; Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 117-18) find difficulty in explaining the scarcity of information provided by Acts for Paul's missionary work in the regions covered by Acts 15:40-16:9 until the point where he arrives in Macedonia (see infra, n. 32 to ch. V).

²⁵Cf. William Neil, The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, MNTC (London, 1950), pp. 21-24; also Rigaux, Thess., pp. 385-87. Paul may be using hyperbole in his praise, but in view of the strategic position of Thessalonica and Corinth in terms of communication and trade, it could be meant literally. But as will be indicated later, Paul took time to develop and to organize whole areas. So, undoubtedly, time was taken while en route to Achaia to start and to establish churches in communities along the way. Sufficient time--which would include time that he had already spent in Achaia--would therefore be allowed for word of the Thessalonians' example and influence to spread "everywhere" from their strategic communication centre. There would be, therefore, no need to postpone the writing of I Thessalonians to a later time than Paul's residence in Achaia, contra Buck and Taylor, Saint Paul, pp. 50-52. See also infra, n. 35.

²⁶Contra Neil, Thess., p. 21; Rigaux, Thess., p. 385; Martin Dibelius, An die Thessalonicher I II an die Philipper, Hdb. zum N.T., 11. (Zweite Aufl.; Tübingen, 1925), p. 5. This is the conception of Acts, cf. Philippe H. Menoud, "Le plan des Actes des Apôtres", NTS, I (1954-1955), 48-49.

²⁷Paul, p. 248.

²⁸Contra Acts 17:1-10; cf. Marxsen, Introduction, p. 33.

²⁹Cf. Rigaux, Thess., p. 461.

³⁰For discussion of these verses, see Rigaux, Thess., pp. 218-22, 457-76, Best, Thess., pp. 123-38, Neil, Thess., ad loc. What hindered Paul from returning to Thessalonica remains unknown. Opposition to the gospel was experienced by Christians generally, by Paul and by the Thessalonians. Some have seen the trouble detaining Paul in Athens to be illness, but this is generally rejected; others conjecture that there would be a threat to Jason should Paul return. Though the troubles depicted in Acts 16:19-17:14a involve only Paul and Silas, yet Timothy is identified with Paul and Silas, and all their opponents in Thessalonica would have known it. On this count, therefore, Jason's security would hardly be less threatened by Timothy's return than by Paul's, if that should have been the reason for Paul's hesitation. It is true, the persecution troubling the Thessalonians (v. 4) worried Paul (see the note on "I Thessalonians 3:3: σὺ (ὡς) θάλλει", by H. Chadwick, JTS, N.S., I [1950], 156-58); but the "we" is inclusive, and so also involves the persecution that Paul himself is suffering in Athens. Something other or more than the usual causes suggested evidently detained him. What it was can only be conjectured. The memory retained in Acts 17:18-20, 22, 32; 18:1 may possibly allude to the same trouble that Paul says detained him in Athens.

³¹DeWitt, Epicurus, pp. 48-49; C. F. Evans, "'Speeches' in Acts", in Mélanges: Rigaux, pp. 293-94; and Cadbury, Acts in History, pp. 51-52, on Acts 17:18-19, Paul's encounter with the Athenians, take the story in Acts as indicating a much more serious situation for Paul than has often been supposed (e.g., T. W. Manson, "The Letters to the Thessalonians" in idem, Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, ed. Matthew Black [Manchester, 1962], p. 264). If so, it might be that incident which was behind the statement, "but Satan hindered us."

³²See Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 49-55; Munck, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 51-53; Neil, Thess., p. 21.

³³Cf. Hurd, I Cor., p. 26, n. 3.

³⁴Of interest as an item of evidence supplied by Acts 18:5 is the note that Timothy rejoined Paul while Paul was actively engaged in preaching in Corinth (but see Knox, Chapters, p. 86, n. 9). Though Acts mentions nothing about any return journey by Timothy to Thessalonica and yet includes Silas with Timothy as coming back to Paul at Corinth, nevertheless this could be a combination of traditions of at least two different missions, one by Timothy and another (others) by Timothy and Silvanus, the first from

Athens, the other(s) from Achaia to Macedonia. There is no evidence in Paul's letters that he wrote I Thessalonians after he had left Achaia, i.e., when he had arrived in Ephesus; indeed, the sequence of references, I Thess. 3:1-2; 3:6, and the information provided by I Cor. 2:1-5 and II Cor. 1:19, would seem to rule that out.

³⁵On Gaius' order in the year 40 for his statue to be set up in the temple, see Loeb, Josephus, B.J. II, 184-203; on the Jews' attitude towards Gaius "as a second Antiochus Epiphanes", see M. P. Charlesworth, Gaius, p. 666; and on this event as the background of Paul's discussion in II Thess. 2, see Bruce, Epistles of Paul, pp. 928-29, and Buck and Taylor, Saint Paul, pp. 150-62. Though for Paul Gaius is not "the man of lawlessness" (contra Buck and Taylor, see II Thess. 2:3-4; cf. Best, Thess., pp. 280-310, and Neil, Thess., pp. 162-64; also Rigaux, Thess., pp. 266-73, 653-61), yet he may be the man, and his sacriligious act the immediate event, that first created the eschatological misunderstanding among the Thessalonians, which Paul corrected at the very time that it was happening. Buck and Taylor even identify the restraining one with Gaius' successor, Claudius. They suggest an early dating for Paul's Macedonian ministry, but their position is arrived at on opposite grounds from those suggested here. They start with the stir caused by Gaius' act and his subsequent murder, and then suggest that II Thessalonians reflects it, and so date the Macedonian ministry by it. In this study Paul's ministry in Macedonia is dated early on other grounds obtained from evidence within Paul's letters. The coincidence of its timing with Gaius' action and murder then suggests the background reason for the letter. But Buck and Taylor in supposing a Pauline eschatology based on Daniel fail to see that in II Thessalonians Paul is dissociating his gospel from any such time schedule or scheme (see supra, pp. 21-26). There is no evidence that I Thess. 1:10 and 2:16 refer to the famine of 46 (as read into it by Buck and Taylor) for there is no reason why those passages could not refer to Gaius' order to set up his statue in the temple. This event affected Jews, not Christians, while the famine struck everyone alike, not just the persecuting Jews whom I Thess. 2:16 seems to isolate for the wrath of God. So I Thessalonians could have been written not after 46 but soon after 40.

³⁶For further discussions relevant to this meeting, see Introduction, pp. 6-9 and nn. 3-7; ch. 2, pp. 46, 56 and nn. 35, 49, 50; ch. 3, pp. 77-80 and nn. 7, 19, 20, 22; ch. 4, pp. 97, 110 and nn. 3, 30; ch. 5, pp. 167-72 including nn., especially n. 32.

De Young, Jerusalem, pp. 14-15, maintains that Paul makes a distinction between the Hellenistic and the Hebraic forms of the name for Jerusalem, using the former for the geographical, political city, and the latter for the heavenly or ecclesiastical city. Textual evidence in Paul's letters, however, does not bear this out without undue strain, cf. Lloyd Gaston, No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels, Supplements to NovTest, XXIII (Leiden, 1970), pp. 4-5. It seems more logical to suppose that where Jews were plentiful among his readers, Paul would use the Hebraic name, but that where his readers were predominantly Gentile and possibly removed from strong Hebraic influence (such as would be especially the case in North Galatia in comparison with Corinth or Rome), he would use their own Hellenistic terminology. His use of the Hebraic name in Gal. 4:26 would be the only exception, under the stress of his argument from Hebrew Scripture.

³⁷Chapters, p. 58. Of course, this would be impossible on the chronology suggested by Acts 15:22-21:17, followed recently by Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 49-52.

³⁸The ethnic sense of Γαλατῆς is one of the strong reasons for the North Galatia theory (see Deissmann, Paul, p. 247, also J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations [10th ed.; London, 1890], pp. 1-56), which has recently again been supported by Heinrich Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, Meyer (12 Aufl.; Göttingen, 1962), pp. 5-6; Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 191-193; Marxsen, Introduction, pp. 45-46; Robert Jewett, "The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation", NTS, XVII (1970-1971), 209; Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 116-17; and many others (for a list of them, see Hurd, I Cor., pp. 303-304, n. 7). However, all North or South Galatia theorists (for a list of the latter, see Hurd, pp. 304-305, n. 9; also recently, F. F. Bruce, "Galatian Problems 2. North or South Galatians?", BJRL, LII [1969-1970], 243-66) base much of their arguments upon the account in Acts, especially chs. 13-14, 16, which tend to collapse if the evidence from Acts is removed. But for reasons which are implied in Paul's principle and plan of mission suggested in this study, the North Galatian theory is accepted.

³⁹Cf. Marxsen, Introduction, p. 45; F. F. Bruce, "Galatian Problems 4. The Date of the Epistle", BJRL, LIV (1971-1972), 251-52; and the discussion by Burton, Gal., pp. 239-41.

⁴⁰Contra Richardson, Israel, p. 71, who places Galatians first in Paul's series of letters, with consequent difficulties for the interpretation of the troubles and the identification of the troublemakers in Galatia. Also contra Bruce, Galatian Problems 4, p. 253, and Lightfoot, Gal., p. 42 (from whom he borrows the suggestion), who throw out "so quickly" as evidence of time. But Paul is not musing about the relative duration of kingdoms and of eternity, but impatiently rebuking the Galatians about a matter involving concrete time measured within the range of his own experiences with them. The phrase, therefore, must be read within the context of the anxiety of a missionary on the field. Bruce is right in protesting that argumentation for dating Galatians near Romans cannot be on the basis of close parallelism or development of thought (pp. 254-55). Nevertheless, after having established the likely chronology and sequence of events and letters, Paul's historical and experiential situation may then provide reasons for the close parallelism between the two.

⁴¹H. C. Snape, "The Fourth Gospel, Ephesus, and Alexandria", HTR, XLVII (1954), 1-14, passim. Of interest in this connection is a letter written by Claudius in 41 to the Alexandrian Jews (see H. Idris Bell, ed., Jews and Christians in Egypt: The Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy, Illustrated by Texts from Greek Papyri in the British Museum [London, 1924], pp. 1-37, and comments by Cadbury, Acts in History, p. 116).

⁴²A tradition in Acts (13:2-3) knew that Prisca and Aquila were tentmakers, and also this is how it remembered Paul. It must be acknowledged that Acts alone provides this information, but since it would not be of such a kind for the compiler of Acts to want to

alter to, nor for anyone to create, it is likely to be a genuine tradition.

⁴³Many factors may have been involved in Paul's moves from one place to another. Centres from which he could preach the gospel to the greatest advantage in respect of entire provinces may have been of primary concern, but economic conditions may also have carried some weight in making such decisions. His relations with Macedonia seem to have been economically more satisfactory than those with Achaia; but Macedonia, even though a relatively poor province in the economy of the Roman Empire, was economically much better off than financially stricken Achaia. Corinth itself was primarily a commercial centre, a hostelry for traders en route to Rome or to the East, an exchange place for bankers; so though commercially important and thriving, it was not industrially very productive. (On Macedonia's and Achaia's economy, see M. P. Charlesworth, Trade Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire [2d ed., rev.; Cambridge, England, 1926], pp. 115, 120-121, 126; F. Oertel, "The Economic Unification of the Mediterranean Region: Industry, Trade, and Commerce", CAH, X, 402-403; Theodor Mommsen, The Provinces of the Roman Empire: From Caesar to Diocletian, trans. William P. Dickinson [2 vols.; London, 1909], I, 261, 292; J. A. O. Larsen, "Roman Greece", in Tenny Frank, ed., An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome [5 vols.; Baltimore, 1933-1940], IV, 465, 471-72, 482-86.)

After the church was established in Corinth, Paul, Prisca, and Aquila found cause to move to Ephesus. This may have been caused by economic pressures, for Ephesus was far more suited as a main trading and industrial centre than Corinth, and Asia was far more prosperous than Achaia. Ephesus was the great port for trade as well as being on highways into the interior, e.g., to Colossae, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, and on trade routes north and south and to all parts of the Empire. (On Ephesus and Asia, see T. R. S. Broughton, "Roman Asia", in Economic Survey, Frank, IV, 817-22, 839, 858, 860-61; Oertel, op. cit., p. 412; W. M. Ramsay, "Roads and Travel [in NT]", in HDB [vol. V, 1904], 382, 388. Also see Loeb, Strabo, Geog. Frag. VII, for Macedonia; VIII, for Achaia; XII, 576-XIV, passim, for Asia; for specific areas and cities, see Strabo, index, XVII.)

⁴⁴George S. Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry: A Reconstruction with Special Reference to the Ephesian Origin of the Imprisonment Epistles (London, 1929), also, "The Epistles of the Imprisonment in Recent Discussion", ExT, XLVI (1934-1935), 293-98, and "Were Paul's Imprisonment Epistles written from Ephesus?", ExT, LXVII (1955-1956), 163-66. See also Donald T. Rowlingson, "Paul's Ephesian Imprisonment: An Evaluation of the Evidence", ATR, XXXII (1950), 1-7; John Knox, "The Epistle to Philemon: Introduction and Exegesis", IB, XI (1955), 555-56; and Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 244-45. In favour of Rome are Dodd, Change and Development; Moule, Col., pp. 21-25; and Francis W. Beare, "The Epistle to the Colossians: Introduction and Exegesis", IB, XI (1955), 134-37.

⁴⁵For a different relationship of the key figures to one another, see John Knox, Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon (Chicago, 1942), especially pp. 39-76, and Philemon Among the Letters of Paul (London, 1960); also

Edgar J. Goodspeed, New Solutions of New Testament Problems (Chicago, 1927), especially pp. 50-64, and The Meaning of Ephesians (Chicago, 1933). For comments on these and other views, see Moule, Col., pp. 14-21.

⁴⁶Contra Moula, Col., p. 137, and Kittel, TDNT, I, 196-97. Imprisonments following riots or other civil disturbances often involve a number. It is therefore not at all difficult to see how Paul could have co-workers as fellow prisoners. It is more difficult to see how he could limit such a spiritualized term (if that is what it was) to so few of his trusted helpers. Indeed, the term could still be used in a military sense by Paul, but as soldiers of Christ taken captive by the enemy. See Moulton-Milligan, p. 601, and Knox, Letters of Paul, p. 28, n. 19.

⁴⁷Imprisonment under Roman law was primarily to hold persons for trial, and not for punishment, see T. W. Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus: The Date of the Epistle to the Philippians", BJRL, XXIII (1939) [also in idem, Studies], 186-87. This, however, may not always have been the case in Jewish practice, cf. Ezra 7:26. Some of Paul's imprisonments may have been Jewish and not Roman; see "Crimes and Punishments", A. R. S. Kennedy, rev. by B. J. Roberts, in HDB (rev. ed., 1963), p. 190, no. 9.

⁴⁸For a suggested background of Paul's situation which raises these questions, one might ask whether some such imprisonment as that noted above (p. 54), and some such punishment as these beatings were the reasons that Prisca and Aquila "risked their necks" (Rom. 16:4) for Paul by taking upon themselves the responsibility for sending him out of the area to Galatia, see infra, notes to ch. 4, n. 80. At least Paul can hardly be called a "sick, delicate man", considering all that he was compelled to endure, contra Bornkamm, Paul, p. xxvi, and others. See Munck, Salvation of Mankind, p. 325, and Knox, Chapters, pp. 90-91.

⁴⁹The chronological sequence, 1) the Jerusalem conference, followed by 2) the Antioch incident, which we have argued for from evidence in Paul's letters, is also held by Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 91-96, against many scholars, who, like himself, traditionally fit their chronology within the framework provided by Acts. For further discussion of the significance of the Antioch incident, see infra, n. 19 to ch. 3.

⁵⁰This offering probably had no relation to the severe drought noted by Suetonius, Claudius XVII; and Josephus, Ant. III, 320-21 (but see note 'a', ad loc., Loeb [1967]; in the latter "Claudius" is a slip and should have been "Nero", thus the two references refer to different famines, the latter after Paul's time). Cf. also Burnett Hillman Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates (1st ed., rev.; London, 1930), pp. 556-57, n. 1. Streeter thinks that the delegates taking the famine offering from Antioch to Jerusalem were not Barnabas and Paul, but "Barnabas and another", erroneously imagined by Luke to be Paul. The need for relief requested at the Jerusalem conference was more likely due to the Jerusalem community's consumption of capital, which left them with scant resources, if Acts 4:34-37; 6:1-4 is a true account of

their economic policy.

⁵¹Cf. Johannes Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, Meyer, Fünfte Abteilung (10. Aufl.; Göttingen, 1925), p. 381, and Manson, St. Paul in Ephesus, p. 188, who also suggest that Paul communicated orally with the Galatians about the offering on his second visit (i.e., Acts 18:23).

⁵²Though the compiler of Acts may have his traditions out of order, Acts 18:20-23 and 19:1b may reflect the author's awareness that sometime after Paul had been in Ephesus he went to Palestine, and then returned to Ephesus, after stopping in Antioch, via Galatia and Phrygia, "strengthening all the disciples". If so, then this memory-fragment would reflect exactly what this study is suggesting occurred according to a chronology based on Paul's letters. That is, on the way back to Ephesus, now knowing that he was completing his work in the eastern theatre, Paul began the organizational work which that entailed. En route, he visited the churches of his friend and colleague, Barnabas, with whom he went to Jerusalem, and so naturally with whom he returned thus far. Then he continued on to his own region of Galatia (that Acts 18:23 refers to North Galatia, see also Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 116-17), and finally arrived back in Ephesus.

⁵³Cf. Hurd, I Cor., pp. 138-39, who argues that I Corinthians was written in the spring, a month or two before Pentecost, basing his argument on the reference to Pentecost in I Cor. 16:8 and the reference in 4:19, "I will come to you soon", and that the season suggested the metaphor of the leaven in 5:6b-8. But the unity of I Corinthians is debatable (see for summaries of the debate, Hering, I Cor., pp. xii-xv, and Hurd, pp. 43-58, which include their own views). Buck and Taylor, Saint Paul, pp. 28-29, who also depend upon the unity of I Corinthians for much of their arguments, yet without dependence upon the unity, have given a strong reason for the letter to have been written in the spring. They note that within the same section, 16:1-9, Paul not only states that he will remain in Ephesus until Pentecost, but that he may even stay the winter with the Corinthians when he arrives there. If the letter had been written the previous autumn, they argue, Paul would hardly have been referring to a second winter away; then, of course, the season suggests the Passover metaphor of 5:7-8. None of this, however, alters the argument that, upon his return to Ephesus from the Jerusalem conference, Paul immediately initiated the final stage of his mission in the East, no matter how he may have set that programme in motion.

⁵⁴See Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 206-11; Marxsen, Introduction, pp. 81-82.

⁵⁵The boundaries of Illyricum were variable and are difficult to determine. In general it was bounded by the Adriatic on the west, Moesia (and Macedonia) on the east, Pannonia on the north, and Epirus on the south; see articles, "Illyricum", in Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie, Fernand Cabrol et Henri Leclercq, t. VII (Paris, 1926), Pt. 1, 90-95; in Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Georg Wissowa, Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kroll, Bd. IX (Stuttgart, 1914), 1, 1085-

88; and in IDB, II, 681. This would indicate that Macedonia was bounded on the west by Illyricum and Epirus. This might have been so, but the land as far as the Adriatic was assigned by Rome in the republican period to the governor of Macedonia and was so during the period of the empire; see Mommsen, Provinces, pp. 298-99. So, in Paul's time, as the article in the Dictionnaire d'Archéologie, p. 95, concludes, Illyricum was equivalent to Dalmatia and Pannonia, that is, as Mommsen says, p. 298, Macedonia "reached from Sea to Sea". In that case, Paul (Rom. 15:19) probably meant that he had gone as far as the north-west borders of Macedonia, i.e., as far west as the sea, and at least as far north as Illyricum.

⁵⁶Introduction, pp. 81-89.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

¹See Adolf Harnack, The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, trans. and ed. James Moffatt (2 vols., 2d rev. ed.; London, 1908), I, 1-18; Deissmann, Paul, p. 86; Guignebert, Jewish World, pp. 211-215; Cadbury, Acts in History, pp. 73-74; Dalbert, Die Theologie, p. 16; and Victor Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews, trans. S. Applebaum (Philadelphia, 1959), pp. 273-88, 342, noting their references to statements by ancient authors, especially to Josephus, Philo, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius, and to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

²Paul, p. 238.

³On the organization of the Jews in the Diaspora, their rights and powers, see Guignebert, op. cit., pp. 215-21, and Tcherikover, op. cit., pp. 301-302, 356-357.

⁴The first Gentile Christian meeting-places may well have been the homes of those Christians financially able to provide a place of sufficient size, see C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, BNTC (London, 1957, reprinted with minor changes, 1962), p. 283; Dodd, Rom., pp. 236-37; William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, ICC (5th ed., 1902), p. 420; and Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, ICC (2d ed., 1914), p. 398. Cf. also Hering, I Cor., p. 186, who sees this as a possibility, but not altogether apart from general assemblies of the congregation, though he does not indicate where these general assemblies met.

⁵Ἕθνη is generally used in both the O. T. and the N. T. to denote Gentiles in contrast to Israelites, though often this distinction is lacking (see in TDNT, II, article by Karl Ludwig Schmidt and Georg Bertram, "ἔθνος, ἔθνικός", pp. 364-72).

⁶So Schmithals, Paul and James, pp. 46-62. The problems involved centre round the interpretation of Gal. 2:7 and 2:9. Some interpret 2:9 to mean an ethnic division; so Schmithals, loc. cit.; Keith F. Nickle, The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy, SBT,

No. 48 (London, 1966), p. 114, n. 139; Barrett, Christianity at Corinth, p. 294, though more recently, in I Cor., p. 211, he interprets 9:20 to mean that "Paul conducted a mission to Jews" (agreeing with Weiss). Others interpret Gal. 2:9 to mean a geographical division, i.e., Paul was to evangelize Jews and Gentiles in his area, and Peter both in his; so Burton, Gal., pp. 96-99; Raymond T. Stamm, "The Epistle to the Galatians: Introduction and Exegesis", IB, X (1953), 474-76; cf. Munck, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 119-22. Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 39-40, interprets the agreement to be neither geographic nor ethnic, and as involving not a total acceptance of Paul's gospel but only non-interference. On the syntactical use of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in the respective clauses, see Burton, loc. cit.

⁷If the Jerusalem conference was the pivotal point at which Paul turned away from a former practice of going both to Jews and to Gentiles, then of course the aorist would point to his previous practice. Those who, on the basis of the chronology of Acts, see the turning point at the conference, also make Paul's ministry to the wider Gentile fields that lay beyond Syria and Cilicia begin at this time. This would mean that throughout all that region Paul's mission was non-Jewish. Paul's use of the perfect tense in 9:22b, however, destroys this argument because it carries a previous practice into the post-conference period (cf. Osborne, Silent Years, p. 60, who calls attention to the present tense of $\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\iota\varsigma$ in Gal. 2:2 as proof "that Paul's gospel has not changed"). Thus from the beginning of his ministry, "among the Gentiles" meant for him, "to everyone in all the lands of the world", to Jews as well as to Gentiles. The intensity of this commitment can be seen in the use of the aorist, $\epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omega\sigma\alpha$, in 9:19, literally, "I made myself a slave" (cf. Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, " $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, . . . $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\omicron}\omega$ ", in TDNT, II, 279). That the policy referred to in I Cor. 9:19-23 was used against him by his opponents, can be seen by his defensive arguments in his letters; see Hurd, I Cor., pp. 126-31. Paul, however, could not isolate any group from hearing the gospel. His mission, then, always included Jews. Cf. Barrett, I Cor., pp. 210-16. Consequently, not even if, following Acts for the chronology of Paul's career, one should make Paul's independent mission begin after the Jerusalem conference could it be said that it was the turning point in Paul's mission from missionizing Jews to converting Gentiles. For since he can be seen to go to Jews in all his letters, which in the Acts' chronology would follow the conference, he surely did so before. At the same time, we know that he included Gentiles afterwards; but surely also beforehand, first, because that was the point of the conference, and second, because according to Gal. 1:15-16, his call to go to the Gentiles came at his conversion. Certainly he did not wait 14--even 17--years before obeying that order. His mission was, therefore, ecumenical from the beginning. Thus the conference was in that sense definitely not a turning point in his ecumenical practices.

⁸Against Schmithals, Paul and James, pp. 46-62. Schmithals' treatment of objections to his view, pp. 54-62, is contrary to the ecumenism that in practice Paul himself claims. See Schlier, Gal., p. 56.

⁹Contra Schmithals, op. cit., pp. 48-50, 89-90, who misunderstands Paul's practice by saying that Paul went only to the Gentiles

and not to the Jews. To be sure, the principle of circumcision counted for nothing for Paul on the higher level of being incorporated in the church; yet as a sign of one's ethnic origins and contributions, it was not to be abolished for Jews, even though it was not to be practised by Gentiles. It was a sign of being a Jew, nationally; it was not a sign for either of being a Christian (cf. Rom. 4:9-13). So again, though misunderstood by Jews and Gentiles alike, Paul's ecumenism rose above ethnic and cultural differentiations, which, evidently in themselves, had value for the new community, in which sameness was not expected in order to have corporate oneness or solidarity.

¹⁰Cf. Rigaux, Thess., pp. 61-62, 397-99, who regards Paul's fear of being compared with wily, itinerant sophists who competed with new doctrines and philosophies everywhere in the Hellenistic world, and who might endanger his converts' faith and their loyalty to him, as the reason for both Timothy's mission and this letter of praise and encouragement. He also notes that these words are not directed against adversaries (who would not be reading his letter, for they are outside the church; cf. Dibelius, Thess., excursus, pp. 9-10, and his notes on 3:6-10); hence the praise for their loyalty. The high standards that Paul preached and exemplified in himself and in his work may indeed have solidified the Macedonian church behind him (cf. the same reaction of the Hellenists towards Judaism, see Dalbert, Theologie, p. 23). Rigaux nevertheless relies on Acts for his identification of those behind the persecutions which the Christians received from their own countrymen as Jews, pp. 442-43; also James Everett Frame, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, ICC (1912), pp. 9-10, 72-73; and Neil, Thess., pp. xv-xvii, who includes pagan persecutors.

¹¹Though Frame, Thess., pp. 9-10, 108-10, may be right in seeing Jews behind the troubles that Paul and his helpers experienced in Philippi and Thessalonica (cf. 2:15-16; 2:2), yet 2:14 and 1:9 seem to indicate that there is no connection between the two kinds of trouble, and that the troubles experienced by Gentile converts came not from Jews, but from pagans. While συνφυλετῶν (2:14), "fellow-countrymen", can be local rather than ethnic (so Rigaux, Thess., p. 443), this need not determine that Jews are meant. For even then, in the entire context the local colour is far more likely to be Gentile than Jewish (against Richardson, Israel, pp. 104-105; cf. Best, Thess., p. 114). Paul is making a deliberate comparison between the Thessalonians and their "fellow-countrymen" and the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem and elsewhere and theirs. Marxsen, Introduction, pp. 32-33, rejects the idea that Jews were involved in the troubles in Thessalonica. See also Best, op. cit., pp. 16-22, concerning opponents in Thessalonica, the nature and identity of whom, he says, if there were any, are vague.

¹²See Arndt-Gingrich, p. 671. Rigaux, Thess., pp. 406-407, takes it in the passive sense of being led into error; cf. Moulton-Milligan, p. 516.

¹³See Arndt-Gingrich, p. 28; Liddell-Scott, p. 46; also Rigaux, Thess., p. 407.

¹⁴See Arndt-Gingrich, p. 202; Liddell-Scott, p. 443.

¹⁵For a description of these practices, see A. D. Nock, Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo (Oxford, 1933), pp. 77-98; also, Neil, Thess., pp. 36-37; and Rigaux, Thess., pp. 407-408.

¹⁶See Arndt-Gingrich, p. 441; Liddell-Scott, p. 971; Moulton-Milligan, p. 352; cf. Frame, Thess., pp. 97-98; Rigaux, Thess., pp. 411-16; and Dibelius, Thess., pp. 7-8.

¹⁷See Arndt-Gingrich, p. 301, col. 1, no. 1.b.β; Dibelius, Thess., p. 6; Best, Thess., pp. 81-83. Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 338, who says that in Acts 9:35 Jews are meant, yet notes other passages in Acts where the same verb is used of the conversion of Gentiles. But Sharon and Lydda had a large Gentile population (cf. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles, MNTC [London, 1931], p. 86); so Acts 9:35 still could refer to the conversion of Gentiles, as the use of the verb would indicate. Yet in support of Haenchen, it must be admitted that Jews could also have "a change of mind", and that the word could be appropriate for their conversion as well. Therefore, the context of I Thess. 1:9 is the determining factor.

¹⁸This verse is rejected by J. C. O'Neill, The Recovery of Paul's Letter to the Galatians (London, 1972), pp. 56-58, without, however, any textual or MSS evidence to support his emendation. Furthermore, only by debatable exegesis can he presume that v. 8 refers to Jewish astrology, which he claims is impossible. For the verse does not say this; instead it denominates the readers and their former practices as not Jewish but pagan (on which practices see MacGregor, Principalities, pp. 17-28; Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History, trans. Floyd V. Filson [rev. ed. (1962); London, 1962], p. 193), and which Zealot-minded or Zealot-dreading Judaizers could well have exploited, even compromising their own Jewish forms with the Galatians' pagan forms to serve their own strategic ends, cf. Jewett, Agitators, p. 208.

¹⁹The identity of the "false brothers" at Jerusalem and those "sent from James" at Antioch is much debated. These have been identified as (a) "extremely orthodox Jewish Christians from Jerusalem" (so Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 32-33); (b) spies whom official Judaism, or at least the militant branch of the Zealot movement, infiltrated into the church, posing as Christians in order to investigate the activities of the church, especially in regard to the Gentiles (so Dieter Georgi, Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem, Theologische Forschung: Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre, XXXVIII [Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1965], pp. 15-16, including n. 19; Nickle, Collection, p. 45, n. 14, and pp. 46-50, including n. 18, p. 47; Schmithals, Paul and James, pp. 52, 107, including n. 14, who sees them as official Jewish emissaries); (c) a group requiring strict observance of the law, but who are best left unidentified (so Richardson, Israel, p. 93; cf. C. K. Barrett, "ΨΕΥΔΑΤΤΟΞΤΟΛΟΙ [2 Cor 11.13]", in Mélanges: Rigaux, p. 379). All agree that at the conference James, Peter, and John were not in sympathy with these Judaistic demands, but were in agreement with the views of Paul, cf. Hahn, Mission, pp. 47-54, 80-81. Birger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity,

Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, XXII (Lund, 1961), pp. 270-72, with Munck, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 87-134, fail to see any division in the Palestinian church. But this is unrealistic in view of subsequent events, cf. W. D. Davies' review of J. Munck's, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, in NTS, II (1955-1956), 60-72.

The seriousness of the situation, however, at the time of the conference may not have been fully appreciated by these leaders of the Jerusalem church, cf. Nickle, op. cit., pp. 46 ff. For by the time that Paul and Barnabas had arrived in Antioch and had been joined there by Peter, James had sent an emissary (or more) to Peter with a message which caused some alarm. James cannot so soon have had second thoughts so as to restrict fellowship of Jewish Christians with Gentiles. Peter, who had already adopted an open policy on this point, would hardly have reacted so abruptly if that had been the case (nor even if it had only been Jewish Christians who were putting pressure upon James), cf. Schmithals, op. cit., pp. 65-68, including n. 12. The reaction was too alarmist and too sudden, which indicates that something far more ominous was happening. There may have been a connection between the "spies" at Jerusalem, and the message from James to Peter (which may also indicate the force to be given to 2:5). The view of T. W. Manson, "The Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians" (1940), in idem, Studies, pp. 178-81, followed by Bruce, Galatian Problems 1, pp. 307-309, that James had only then heard of Peter's and other Jewish Christians' fraternizing at table with Gentile Christians is hardly tenable in view of the Jerusalem agreement and Peter's own previous policy. It seems more reasonable to suppose that the message conveyed news of a threat of some dire, direct nature, either from the Jewish authorities or from militants in the Zealot movement, if the liberalizing policy of the Christian movement was not halted at once, and that those involved, Peter, the liberal Jewish Christians at Antioch, and James were all possessed by fear. It was not a theological question. And it was not just the mission to the Jews that was in jeopardy, but the very lives of the Jewish Christians in Judaea, and possibly throughout Palestine, for them to have acted as they did, cf. Schmithals, op. cit., p. 89. Zealot Jewish Christians may have collaborated with their non-Christian associates within the Zealot movement to force the issue, regardless whether the false brothers were Zealot-minded, nationalistic Jewish Christians, or actually spies from the outside. According to the chronology suggested in ch. 2, this would suggest an explanation for the sudden, acute eruption of Judaizing efforts throughout Paul's territory immediately after the Jerusalem conference. Whoever they were, they made a concerted campaign against Pauline ecumenism from that moment.

There is no reason to twist Peter's action in Antioch into a gesture of magnanimous graciousness towards intruding Jews from Jerusalem of whatever description, as Helmut Koester, "ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity", HTR, LVIII (1965), 285-86. The historical situation depicts circumstances naturally promoting fear, cf. Barrett, op. cit., pp. 387-88. According to the chronology suggested in this study, Paul never really missionized Antioch, and since he was only on his way back to Ephesus from the Jerusalem conference, his leaving Antioch at this time was in no way due to the failure of his protest, concerning which anyway there is no suggestion in Galatians. Indeed, if he had left for that reason, or if that had been the outcome of this encounter with Peter, he would

hardly have dared to use it as an argument with the Galatians (cf. Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 97-98).

²⁰This affair in Antioch, following immediately on the Jerusalem conference, is proof enough that the problem of Jews and Gentiles associating together, especially at table, had not come up for discussion, and that therefore the so-called Apostolic Decrees had not been formulated; so Bornkamm, Paul, p. 42. This confusion about the decrees results from following Acts; it does not arise from Paul's letters. Hurd, I Cor., pp. 240-70, argues that Paul, when he first arrived back in Ephesus, put the decrees [Acts] into effect in Corinth and then suddenly changed his mind. But this ignores the Antioch problem. Furthermore, Paul's ecumenism was hardly so unstable nor Paul so fickle.

²¹A tentative suggestion could be made at this point that Paul's wording of the agreement in Galatians would indicate not only the support of the leaders in Jerusalem for his methods and goal but also an awakening of interest in the Gentile mission to the point where they may even have encouraged Paul to extend his field at once to the limits of the Roman Empire. At least as a result of the discussion, Paul himself seemed at first assured that the organization of his areas would remain safely within an ecumenical church so that he could, without fear of working in vain, hasten his consolidation of them and go on to more distant fields.

²²See Stamm, Gal., pp. 474-75; Schlief, Gal., p. 56; Lucien Cerfaux, The Christian in the Theology of St Paul, trans. Lilian Soiron (London, 1967), pp. 98-101. See O'Neill, Gal., p. 37 on 2:7-8 for what seems to be a correct suggestion concerning insertions of the sections on Peter. It would leave the conference group-minded rather than individual-minded, i.e., Paul and Barnabas (not just Paul), probably representing other missionaries in their areas, and Peter, James, and John (not just Peter), undoubtedly representing others of the Twelve, and probably representing other missionaries in Judaea and even in the rest of Palestine. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise, pp. 22-25, considers that the restriction of the mission by Peter and the Palestinians was "to the Jews first" because salvation would come to the Gentiles only at the Parousia. He denies any Jewish mission to Gentiles. Against this, see Hahn, Mission, pp. 47-54; cf. Evans, Into Galilee, pp. 12-17. The question concerning the early Jewish Christian view of Christ's reigning Messiahship is involved here. On this see John A. T. Robinson, "The Most Primitive Christology of All?", JTS, N.S., VII (1956), 177-89 [also in, idem, Twelve New Testament Studies, SBT (London, 1962), pp. 139-53], and C. K. Barrett, "I am Not Ashamed of the Gospel", in Foi et Salut Selon S. Paul: Epître aux Romains 1,16, Analecta Biblica, 42 (1970), pp. 30-31. Longenecker, Christology, p. 78, too easily brushes Robinson's view aside. Much of the sharp debate was on this question. In this light, Gal. 2:2 needs to be re-examined. Ἀνεθέμην is usually interpreted as "laid before" (so RSV), i.e., for approval, which would seem to contradict Paul's own view of his gospel (see Gal. 1:8-9; 2:5-7). The verb may rather have the connotation, "impart, communicate something one's own" (so Liddell-Scott, p. 123, B.2); "declare, communicate" (though also as "refer w. the added idea that the pers. to whom a thing is ref. is asked for his opinion", so Arndt-Gingrich, p. 61). "The late sense

'impart,' 'communicate,' with a view to consultation, found in the two NT occurrences of the word", i.e., Acts 25:14, Gal. 2:2 (so Moulton-Milligan, p. 38). It would seem that here the meaning is "impart" or "communicate" to the Jerusalem leaders the true and only gospel, about which Paul had no doubts--though he may indeed have had doubts about the Palestinian Christians' post-resurrection concepts of the Christ-event, cf. II Cor. 5:16.

It is hardly as authorities over himself (cf. 2:6), or over his gospel (cf. 1:7-9, 11; 2:7a) that Paul goes to those in Jerusalem (see David M. Hay, "Paul's Indifference to Authority", JBL, LXXXVIII [1969], 36-44). He wrote Gal. 1:11-2:14 to refute the idea that he had received either from them. So contra Hurd, I Cor., pp. 262-63; and Gerhardsson, Memory, pp. 276-77, 297-98, whose arguments are not proved by his citations. If Paul had wanted to boast of Jerusalem as the source of his tradition, why would he have denied the allegation? To be sure, Paul would not go to Jerusalem to discuss the weather, but he could go to put them straight on the gospel's intent. What is surprising to Paul is what he declared to the Galatians--I found we agreed. If the Jerusalem apostles had taught Paul the tradition, why were they so nonplussed that they had to accept Paul as one sent by Christ himself? Rather, here are two channels of tradition recognizing the same source, which source alone gives the approval. Paul is fighting against this very human tendency to localize and to limit the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ according to human categories of status, worth, power, etc. As Hay points out, Paul is indifferent to these; cf. Bruce, Galatian Problems 1, pp. 302-303; Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 36-39. Yet Paul recognizes that the Jerusalem apostles are the only ones who might have enough influence over the Palestinian missionaries, who are troubling the Gentile fields, to cause them to change their policies--hence the private consultation. Thus Gal. 2:2 is a statement of desperation, not of subservience. As to vv. 3, 6 ff., these are to counter charges of Judaizers who are misrepresenting Paul's reasons for going to Jerusalem. The outcome of the meeting was to divide the areas and to maintain unity. But time was to tell that this was not enough.

²³Contra Nickle, Collection, pp. 86-87, 99, who bases the collection upon the temple tax. Any likeness to the tax may be coincidental, for the offering was in no way a tax (see Munck's criticism, op. cit., pp. 287-90, cf. also Schmithals', Paul and James, p. 79, of Karl Holl's view). So, too, contra Bruce, Galatian Problems 1, p. 305.

Burton, Gal., p. 99, sees $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu$ as qualifying the agreement negatively (so, too, Hurd, I Cor., pp. 262-63, including n. 1), implying that the Jerusalem apostles had the right to refuse acknowledgment of the validity of Paul's work amongst the Gentiles. This, as has been argued above, is the one thing that the apostles perceived they had no control over. As believers in God's freedom of will and action and in the work and witness of the Holy Spirit, they could hardly veto an act of God, nor to all intents and purposes bargain with him for their profit. Burton admits (but does not follow up) a modification of the use of $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu$ to introduce "a qualification of a preceding statement" when he adds, "or of its apparent implications". The offering was the implication of the recognition of God's work through Paul amongst the Gentiles and so of the validity of these churches, because unity in Christ implies sharing with one another for the sake of equality in Christ. The

“ὅτι in v. 10 emphasizes the preceding words $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu \pi\tau\omega\chi\hat{\omega}\nu$ (Arndt-Gingrich, p. 379), who for one reason or another stood in special need (cf. Acts 2:43-47, but see Buck and Taylor, Paul, pp. 149-50, also Sherman E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts", in Stendahl, Scrolls, p. 133). So now that the Gentile churches had been revealed as part of the body of Christ, it follows that they must now assume their part in the consequent responsibility for the welfare of the whole body. Since this, too, was part of Paul's preaching, and inasmuch as he was aware of Jerusalem's need, then of course he gladly accepted the request. But Hurd, subtly relying upon Acts, though arguing against Munck's opposition to a bargaining procedure at the conference table and to the resulting tax, yet fails to perceive that Paul refused to compromise what he was convinced is God's gospel (cf. Gal. 1:7-9), and therefore misinterprets the reason for Paul's journey to Jerusalem and its consequences. Paul assumed the ethical legitimacy of the offering and so innocently enough at first forced the offering upon his churches without proper preparation (cf. I Cor. 16:1-4); but when the Corinthians balked, he changed his tactics and granted its voluntary nature while still maintaining its moral necessity (II Cor. 8-9). But as concerns the Jerusalem meeting, the offering was voluntary throughout and was based not upon a bargaining qualification limiting acknowledgment of unity but upon an enacting qualification of resulting implications of the oneness now established by God.

²⁴See L. S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ (4th ed.; Westminster, 1963), passim, especially, pp. 8 ff., 29, 43; Schmithals, Paul and James, pp. 79-84; Buck and Taylor, Paul, p. 149; cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, The Church in the New Testament, trans. J. J. O'Hara (London, 1965), pp. 128-29. The question whether the offering contained an eschatological significance symbolizing the coming of the Gentiles with their gifts to the eschatological centre of the world, Jerusalem, at the end-time (so Munck, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 303-304, cf. idem, Israel, p. 7) will be examined in its proper context, see especially ch. 6.

²⁵The nature of the trouble-makers in Galatia is a much debated question. That they were Jewish Christian gnostics, see Walter Schmithals, "Die Häretiker in Galatien", ZNW, XLVII (1956), 25-67, republished in rev. form in, idem, Paulus und die Gnostiker: Untersuchungen zu den kleinen Paulusbriefen, Theologische Forschung, XXXV (Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1965), pp. 9-46; and Marxsen, Introduction, pp. 50-58; but see Bruce, Galatian Problems 3, p. 260, and R. McL. Wilson, "Gnostics - in Galatia?", in StEv, IV, 358-67. That they were Galatian Judaizing Gentile Christians, see Munck, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 87-134; A. E. Harvey, "The Opposition to Paul", StEv, IV, 319-32. That the trouble-makers actually were Judaizers, i.e., Jewish Christian missionaries, see Kcester, ΓΝΩΜΑΙ, pp. 307-309, and from Judaea, see Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 32-33, and as under pressure from Zealots, see Jewett, Agitators, pp. 204-208. According to our chronology of circumstances and events, the last appears to be the most plausible case (cf. Burton, Gal., pp. 18-25; see supra, n. 19; also see Loeb, Josephus, Vita 112-13; B.J. II:254-57, 264-65; IV:335-44; cf. Acts 15:1-5; 22:22-23).

²⁶A full discussion of the traditional interpretations

forming the background of Paul's argument is given by Lightfoot, Gal., pp. 158-64; see also Burton, Gal., pp. 159-62; George S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, MNTC (London, 1934), pp. 83-91. For a recent discussion and interpretation, see Bring, Paul, pp. 21-60; and Hendrikus Boers, Theology Out of the Ghetto: A New Testament Exegetical Study Concerning Religious Exclusiveness (Leiden, 1971), passim.

²⁷See De Young, Jerusalem, pp. 118-34. O'Neill's omission of 4:24b-27 (Gal. pp. 62-64) makes a smooth, logical, literary production of this section, but robs Paul of the spontaneity of an irate letter writer, for 24b-27 is apropos to his argument. Paul is making the distinction between those who remain children of bondage and those who are the children of freedom. Indeed, the analogy would be startling and unacceptable if Paul were writing to Jews, but he is not; he is writing to Gentile Christians in North Galatia who have no predetermined interpretations of Israelite history, and so to whom Paul's use of the illustration is pertinent. O'Neill (p. 63) also says that at this time there was no choice necessary between Judaism and Christianity, which in the sense that there was no split between the two, is true. There was, however, a choice between the way of Israel with Christ and the way of Israel without Christ, between the way of the free woman and the way of Hagar. Also contra O'Neill, Paul does not assume that the earthly Jerusalem is the centre of homage for Christians as for Jews; in fact the opposite would seem to be the case, the very point of the distinction that he makes between the two Jerusalems (cf. v. 26 with Phil. 3:20, on which see De Young).

²⁸See Schmidt, TDNT, II, 369-70, no. 3, but see no. 2; also Burton, Gal., p. 160. But the point of Paul's argument is that both Jews and non-Jews, without distinction, are of the seed of Abraham only if they are incorporated not by blood, but by faith in Christ, who alone is the fulfilment of the promise. Therefore, πάντα τὰ ἐν ᾧ includes all, Jews and Gentiles. Cf. Boers, op. cit., p. 96, who recognizes this in Gal. 3:16 and contrasts it with Paul's treatment of the subject in Romans. Cf. also Ellis, Paul's Use of the O. T., p. 122; and Munck, Israel, p. 14.

²⁹In his argument in Galatians, Paul is on one level rejecting or supplanting the law and giving a new law, while on another level he is affirming the law and showing its fulfilment; see Davies, Torah, pp. 90-94. The law remains the absolute will of God as always; but as such it can only condemn man, for man himself cannot fulfil it. God alone justifies man. This God has done in Christ. So to accept Christ is to accept the law, but on the basis of its fulfilment in Christ; is to accept the election; is to be incorporated into the people of God. Paul makes this clear in Galatians for a Gentile congregation, as later he does in Romans for a different group (see infra, ch. 6, pp. 191-92). In Galatians Paul is polemical, arguing against Judaizers who are attempting to make Gentiles into Jews. Therefore, his attack seems to be more destructive of the law than in Romans, which is written for a different purpose, to a different people. See C. E. B. Cranfield, "St. Paul and the Law", Scottish Journal of Theology, XVII (1964), 60-66; C. H. Dodd, "ἐννομὸς Χριστοῦ", in Studia Paulina, Sevenster, pp. 96-101; J. W. Doeve, "Some Notes With Reference to τὰ Λόγια

ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ in Romans III 2", in Studia Paulina, pp. 121-22; cf. Shedd, Man in Community, p. 3; also Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 223-24. See also Bring, Paul, pp. 43-48, and Richardson, Israel, pp. 99-101, who rightly stress the continuum between old Israel and the church, but who do not adequately take into consideration the newness of the situation. See also Boers, Ghetto, pp. 80-82.

³⁰O'Neill, Gal., p. 55, would omit 3:28 as a post-Pauline insertion, because, he says, Paul was living in a different time when he was founding "Gentile congregations . . . alongside the believing synagogues." But as has been argued above (pp. 60-80), Paul's congregations were mixed and not one congregation alongside another. Also, according to the chronology suggested in ch. 2, the verse harmonizes with Paul's own historical situation, in Corinth at the time of writing this letter, when problems were sharply focusing his attention upon other social equalities in Christ. The same equality expressed in v. 28 is also embodied in I Cor. 12:12-13 and in I Cor. 7; see Heinrich Schlier, "The Unity of the Church according to the New Testament", in his, The Relevance of the New Testament, trans. W. J. O'Hara (London, 1968), p. 199. This "no distinction" is clearly emphasized in Romans (cf. ch. 6). It is therefore apropos at this point in his letter to the Galatians, and is thus not post-Pauline but definitely Pauline. To be sure, as O'Neill suggests, v. 29 can follow directly from v. 27, but so it can from v. 28, and so can v. 28 from v. 27. Whether v. 28 belongs in the passage depends upon how pointed and how instructive one thinks Paul wants to make this section of his letter. Considering the historical background and Paul's mood, it would seem that he wishes to be specific, leaving no doubts in anyone's mind as to the significance of his gospel's scope. If such should be the case, then v. 28 is an elucidation of vv. 26-27.

³¹This would tell against any relenting by Paul at any time on this question, especially in regard to Titus at the Jerusalem conference (contra Smith, Pauline Problems, pp. 118-19; see Barrett, Titus, pp. 4-5). If Gal. 5:11 is read as it stands, then Paul, in order to point up a ridiculous charge against him, purposely posed for his readers this ridiculous question, both sections of which imply a present action continuous with past practice, thus a trap in logic. Since then each clause obviously cancels the other out, he mocks the allegation. If, however, the first ἔτι is omitted (so O'Neill, Gal., p. 64), then a meaning more in accord with the background situation which produced this letter is possible. For then Paul is insisting that his policy has not changed from what it was before he went to Jerusalem. The implied answer to his question in 5:11 is therefore obvious and is contained earlier in his letter in 2:3-9.

This raises the question concerning Timothy's circumcision, cf. Acts 16:1-3. Though Paul includes Timothy in the address of Colossians, yet he does not include him in the greetings as one numbered with those "of the circumcision" (Col. 4:10-11, cf. Moule, Col., p. 137). See arguments by E. Earle Ellis, "Those of the Circumcision and the Early Christian Mission", in StEv, IV, 390-99, and article on "Ἐπ' αἰῶς", by Walter Gutbrod, TDNT, III, 389. Ellis, pp. 391-92, claims as a basis for his argument for the distinction between Hebrew and Hellenist, "Hebrews designated those Jews with a strict, ritualistic viewpoint" as against the freer

Hellenists; but see Gutbrod. Ellis (p. 395, n. 3) refers to Paul as "the former Hebrew". But nowhere does Paul call himself a "former Hebrew". Phil. 3:4-5 refers clearly to his present and continuous standing as a Hebrew, yet certainly not as a ritualistic Jew, cf. II Cor. 11:22 (present tense, but certainly he does not place himself in the same category as his opponents). This then raises the possibility that Paul employs the phrase, *ἐκ περιτομῆς* as a designation of "Jew" in a much broader sense than allowed by the word "Hebrew", i.e., a Palestinian Jew, in order to include any ethnic Jew, especially in a Gentile environment. Cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, pp. 478-82.

Contra Bring, *Paul*, pp. 32-33, Paul did think of the rite of circumcision as invalid as far as the important subject of being incorporated in Christ is concerned. To be sure, the absolutes of God, such as revealed law and will, have no higher and lower stages; but man's position in relation to them has its stages. In this sense, the earlier stage of Israel is supplanted by a later stage of fulfilment (cf. Pierre Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament", in Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul and Qumran*, pp. 26-27; C. K. Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles", in Sevenster, *Studia Paulina*, p. 18; and Dodd, *Rom.*, pp. xxxii-xxxiii). To reject the later, or to choose to live according to the structures of the earlier is to move backward; also contra Richardson, *Israel*, pp. 97-98. In the limited sense of seeing temporal value in a national heritage and in the historical distinction of election, Paul does not reject circumcision or the advantages there are for Jews being Jews (cf. *Rom.* 3:1-4; 9:4-5); or for that matter, Gentiles being Gentiles (cf. Davies, *Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 322); but that is on a lower plane than their equality in Christ.

³²Cf. Bruce, *Galatian Problems* 3, pp. 266-70; Eduard Schweizer, "The Disciples of Jesus and the Post-Resurrection Church", in *idem*, *Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963*, (Zürich/Stuttgart, 1963), pp. 249-50. Also cf. Phil. 3:2 ff. and see H. R. Moehring, "Some Remarks on *σάρξ* in Philippians 3, 3ff.", in *StEv*, IV, 432-36; Helmut Koester, "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment (Philippians III)", *NTS*, VIII (1961-1962), p. 323.

³³*Thess.*, pp. 5-10.

³⁴See Frame, *Thess.*, p. 82, and Neil, *Thess.*, pp. 15-19. See also the discussion on the grammatical construction of *ὅτι* (1:5) in vv. 4-6, in Dibelius, *Thess.*, pp. 3-4, and in Rigaux, *Thess.*, pp. 368-73 (372-73) on whether *ὅτι* refers back to *εἰσότες* or *ἐκλογὴν*. In either case, as the arguments in this study suggest, Paul himself needs no proof of the election of the Gentiles (cf. *Gal.* 1:15-16). Cf. Best, *Thess.*, pp. 73-76.

³⁵Cf. Marxsen, *Introduction*, pp. 35-36. Most take Paul's meaning figuratively, i.e., emulating his life, not carrying on his missionary work. See the discussion on 1:6-9 in John W. Bailey, "The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians: Introduction and Exegesis", *IB*, XI (1955), 262-64; Frame, *Thess.*, pp. 83-86; and Rigaux, *Thess.*, pp. 386-87. Yet Paul and his helpers are their examples. See Willis de Boer, *The Imitation of Paul: An Exegetical Study* (Kampen, 1962), pp. 92-126. Persecution is a consequence of public demonstrations that run counter to the *status quo*. Exemplary

living would in itself not provoke such outbursts of persecution as depicted in 2:14, but public witnessing in the active sense of promotion would cause a stir among hostile people.

The λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου is an active word; see Rigaux, Thess., p. 160. It is the word of the Lord that has sounded forth (ἐξηχεῖν, a rare word, used as of thunder, Ecclus. 40:13, etc.) from the Thessalonians everywhere. Thessalonica was on a busy cross-road of the world. There seems to be no reason against taking this pss. therefore to mean that as they themselves went from place to place trading--or even in their own market-places--they spread that word by every means until the earth vibrated with its sound (i.e., the ἀπό [v. 8] may be causative or instrumental [see uses of ἀπό, Arndt-Gingrich, p. 87, V; Liddell-Scott, p. 192, col. 1, III.4]). Paul himself and his workers were that kind of example as well. From some of such "tested" ones (cf. II Cor. 8:22) Paul may have secured regional as well as local helpers (e.g., Phil. 4:3?). Hence the joy that runs throughout the letter, cf. Johannes Munck, "I Thess. I.9-10 and the Missionary Preaching of Paul: Textual Exegesis and Hermeneutic Reflexions", NTS, IX (1962-1963), 97.

³⁶Cf. Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., pp. 269-70; Héring, I Cor., pp. 129-30; and Käsemann, Perspectives, pp. 3-5. Nevertheless, the differentiations are bound together by Paul in a basic equality of status before God, and thus in relation to one another. Cf. the Qumran concept of community, but with strict gradations of spiritual (not economic) status: 1 QS V, 23-25, and 1 QH XII, 23. Cf. David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity", Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV, Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls (2d ed.; Jerusalem, 1965), pp. 246-47.

³⁷Cf. Walter Schmithals, The Office of Apostle in the Early Church, trans. John E. Steely (London, 1971), p. 22; Smith, Pauline Problems, p. 121; also Ernest Best, One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul (London, 1955), p. 96, n. 1. T. W. Manson, "The Corinthian Correspondence" (no. 1, 1941; no. 2, 1942), in idem, Studies, p. 192, suggests that such unity and equality extended between the different communities that composed the church. Cf. Paul S. Minear, Images of the Church in the New Testament (London, 1961), pp. 210-11, on Col. 3:9-13. The dynamic of Paul's concept is caught by Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 31. The tension between the existing world conditions and the "not yet", which Paul notes in I Cor. 12-15, cannot serve as an opiate to reconcile individuals to a status quo. Being crucified to the world does not mean this for Paul. Against such an acceptance of the status quo are I Cor. 12:31 and Rom. 12:1-21. Cf. G. B. Caird, "Paul and Women's Liberty", BJRL, LIV (1972), 273-74; Joachim Gnilka, "Geistliches Amt und Gemeinde nach Paulus", in Foi et Salut, Analecta Biblica, 42, pp. 233-40.

³⁸I Cor., p. 134.

³⁹I Cor., p. 285.

⁴⁰Clarence T. Craig, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians: Introduction and Exegesis", IB, X (1953), 165-67; so also Michel Bouttier, Christianity According to Paul, trans. Frank Clarke, SBT, No. 49 (London, 1966), pp. 85-87; John J. Collins, "Chiasmus, the

'ABA' Pattern and the Text of Paul", in Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961, Analecta Biblica, 17-18, pp. 582-83. Cf. H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit", NTS, XII (1965-1966), 241-42.

⁴¹This does not presume any hierarchical organization even in its first stages (contra Mathias Delcor, "The courts of the Church of Corinth and the courts of Qumran", in Murphy-O'Connor, Paul and Qumran, p. 77), but is a call to co-operative labour mutually respected and free from self-seeking rivalry, or even anarchy in the group. Cf. Dibelius, Thess., p. 3; see Rigaux, Thess., p. 363. On ὑποτάσσειν, see Arndt-Gingrich, p. 855, l.b.β, "submission in the sense of voluntary yielding in love". Προϊστῆμι in I Thess. 5:12 and Rom. 12:8, in context, should be read in the same way (Arndt-Gingrich, pp. 713-14), where it may signify "concern" (rather than "authority"), which the others would respect in love (I Thess. 5:13). Note in this connection also I Cor. 16:15; the services rendered are by self-appointment, a voluntary giving of self in Christian labour. See on ἑταῖρον ἐαυτοῦς, Barrett, I Cor., pp. 393-94. Cf. Thornton, Common Life, passim.

⁴²Cf. Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., pp. 147-48, who see here that Paul allows slaves to change from slavery to freedom, if possible, and Hering, I Cor., pp. 55-56, who thinks that Paul abides strictly by his maxim. It would seem that Paul tempered his principles with practical advice correlative with the overlapping of the ages. Not every slave had a Christian master, nor necessarily a happier prospect for himself outside his existing situation. So Paul's general advice, after establishing a principle, was such as to leave the ultimate decision to the person involved; for basically, it really did not matter in Christ. The question of Philemon concerned a specific situation where all parties were Christian, and where the case was well known to Paul.

⁴³See the article by H. Windisch, "Ἑλληνας", TDNT, II, especially, pp. 515-16. It may be true that Ἑλληνας in Rom. 1:14 may mean people "distinguished from others by the Greek language and culture", which may be why Paul uses the antithetical term, βάρβαρος, in order to gain an inclusive and universal sense for ἄνθρωπος; for naturally by implication, inasmuch as he is a Jew and a Pharisee, he is already indebted to Judaism. Thus, Paul reveals in this pss. the every day significance and reality of his principles, i.e., he enters into appreciative dialogue with all strata of society.

⁴⁴See Eric M. Meyers, A. Thomas Kraabel, and James F. Strange, "Archaeology and Rabbinic Tradition at Khirbet Shema': 1970-1971 Campaigns", BA, XXXV (1972), p. 16; but see Barrett, I Cor., p. 331.

⁴⁵See the discussion by Barrett, I Cor., pp. 330-33. In regard to I Cor. 11:10, see Morna D. Hooker, "Authority on her Head: An Examination of I Cor. XI.10", NTS, X (1963-1964), 410-16; also cf. Qumran Scrolls, 1 QSa II,3-10; 1 QM VII,4-6, and H. Neil Richardson, "Some notes on 1 QSa", JBL, LXXVI (1957), 115-16, 120-21; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumran angelology and the angels of I Cor 11:10", in Murphy-O'Connor, Paul and Qumran, pp.

43-47. See also Henry J. Cadbury, "A Qumran Parallel to Paul", HTR, LI (1958), pp. 1-2. For a discussion of the questions above regarding women, see Caird, Women's Liberty, pp. 268-81.

⁴⁶Col., pp. 154-63; see also Houlden, Paul's Letters, pp. 209-15.

⁴⁷Lohse, Col., p. 157, and his note on Conzelmann, pp. 156-57.

⁴⁸Cf. ibid., p. 163, and p. 162, n. 76, quoting Schrage; also Caird, op. cit., pp. 279-81.

⁴⁹Cf. Lohse, Col., pp. 157-58 on Col. 3:18, including notes.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

¹Introduction, p. 178.

²So Bornkamm, Christian Experience, p. 16, and Paul, pp. 54-55; also Cullmann, Le caractère eschatologique, pp. 244-45.

³On the journey to Jerusalem recorded in Acts 18:21-23; 19:1, see B. H. Streeter, "The Primitive Text of the Acts", JTS, XXXIV (1933), 237-38, who rejects "going up" (Acts 18:22) as meaning to Jerusalem; but see G. H. C. Macgregor, "The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction and Exegesis", IB, IX (1954), 246-47; also Haenchen, Acts, p. 544, n. 5. For other suggested solutions, see Haenchen, pp. 542-48, and Menoud, Le plan des Actes, pp. 44-51. It seems likely that Acts 18 reflects Paul's later visit to Jerusalem and that the compiler of Acts confuses that later journey with the memory that Silas returned to Jerusalem when he and Paul left Corinth, at which time Paul remained in Ephesus.

⁴Co-Workers, pp. 437-52, especially the table of terms, p. 438. Some of Ellis' evaluations of these relationships depend upon his use of later, post-Pauline writings. His idea of circles of workers may be correct as long as his concept of a class and sub-classes of brothers is not too rigidly held.

⁵For literature on the much debated subject of Paul's use of the first person singular and plural pronouns, see, for those arguing for an epistolary "we", Ethelbert Stauffer, "ἐγώ", TDNT, II, 343-62, especially 356-58, who thinks that the plur. ὑμεῖς is essentially stylistic, "the style of the cultured man who wishes to keep his person and personal affairs in the background" (p. 356). This can hardly be so, for on that basis, soon after he left Macedonia--and especially when writing to the Galatians, certain letters to the Corinthians, and even Romans--he very quickly forgot his cultured ways (apart from his more personal ones to Philemon and to the Philippians, though why the latter should be so much more personal than, e.g., I-II Thessalonians so that he should drop his cultured form is not said).

Karl Dick, Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus (Halle, 1900), passim, and summary, pp. 167-69, has shown from examples from

late Greek literature and from papyrus letters, that "I" and "we" were used indiscriminately. Therefore, on the basis of certain doubtful cases (e.g., I Thess. 2:1-13; 3:5; especially 2:7, 11), and of the fact that Acts does not name Timothy as having evangelized Thessalonica, he arrived at the conclusion that the plurals in Paul are epistolary (see Rigaux, Thess., p. 79, who rightly countered his argument).

Adolf Deissmann, "Die Sprache der griechischen Bibel", Theologische Rundschau, V (Tübingen, 1902), p. 69, persuaded by Dick's examples and argument, claimed that Paul's use of these pronouns cannot be reduced to any set rules of grammatical usage. So James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. I, Prolegomena (3rd ed.; Edinburgh, 1908), pp. 86-87, declares that it is an exegete's rather than a grammarian's problem. Moulton rightly observes that it is futile to argue from Latin to Greek. Thought modes differ from one language or culture to another. Even a writer skilled in the use of a tongue foreign to him, when writing in that language, often betrays his own language's mode of thought. That being so, then it should be noted that Paul was essentially semitic (Hebraic) and not hellenistic in his background, though of course he was influenced by his hellenistic environment. Consequently, arguments based on Greek thought modes (and the use of pronouns reflects this, whereas the use of the form of a letter does not) cannot be used as arguments for Paul's thought modes, e.g., how he would have used "I" and "we".

There may be psychological justification for Ernst von Dobschütz's argument (Die Thessalonicher-Briefe, Meyer, X [1909], p. 68), that by dictating his letters, Paul would more and more feel a solidarity with the other person and so include him in his thinking; but he concludes that by so doing Paul would not be giving the "co-author" any prerogatives; cf. de Boer, Imitation, pp. 118-19. But there are deeper reasons than this for Paul to join others to himself in his use of "we".

For those against such usage by Paul of the epistolary "we", see Otto Roller, Das Formular der Paulischen Briefe: Ein Beitrag zur Lehre von antiken Briefen, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, Folge 4, Heft 6 (Stuttgart, 1933), pp. 169-87, 578-90; E. H. Askwith, "'I' and 'We' in the Thessalonian Epistles", Ex, Ser. 8, I (1911), 149-50, who says that when Paul "writes 'we' he means 'we'" (p. 153); W. F. Lofthouse, "Singular and Plural in St. Paul's Letters", ExT, LVIII, No. 7 (1946-1947), 171-82, who notes the change back and forth in later letters and suggests that there is a reason in every case; and, idem, "'I' and 'We' in the Pauline Letters", ExT, LXIV, No. 8 (1952-1953), 241-45, suggests that when Paul "wrote 'we', he was thinking of himself as one of a number", i.e., his co-workers or the believers. "The circle expands or contracts; but it is always there when the plural is used; never when it is not." It should also be noted that according to J. J. Kijne, "We, Us and Our in I and II Corinthians", NovTest, VIII (1966), 171-79, the translators, in the pss. discussed, are not troubled with the question, Is this an epistolary plural meaning Paul himself? but only, is it an inclusive "we" (including the Corinthians or Christians generally) or an exclusive "we" (meaning only Paul and his co-workers)? Both, therefore, are considered genuine plurals. See also John W. Fraser, "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: II Corinthians V.16 once more", NTS, XVII (1970-1971), 300, who, though he notes a distinct change in the use of "I" and "we"

from 1:1-2:13 and 2:14 ff., seems quite arbitrary in his selection of instances in II Cor. 2:14-7:4 that are "clearly intended" as personal references, and that are general or group limited. Note also E. B. Allo, Saint Paul: Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens, EtB (Paris, 1937), pp. 167-69, on 5:16.

In regard to the problem of the "we" in Thessalonians, Lofthouse, "I" and "We", p. 241, says, "Save for these three instances [i.e., 'I' pss. in I Thess.] there is nothing self-assertive, nothing that does not suit the little band of evangelists as a whole." He carries his study through all the special uses of "I" and "we" and shows that Paul is always "the spokesman of his group", "their mouthpiece" (pp. 243-44). See also Rigaux, Thess., pp. 77-80, who notes--especially with reference to I-II Thess.--that there is not a single plural which ought not to be genuine; even in the doubtful cases (I Thess. 2:7, ἀπρόσπορος as a title for Silvanus and Timothy; 2:1-13, 17; 3:5, especially 2:7, 11--nurse and father) one can only see an accentuation of Paul's apostolic whim which presents the Christian message as the work of the entire group.

The above studies have been referred to here in relation to the "we" passages which refer to Paul's immediate circle of workers. Concerning the "we" passages where in like manner Paul identifies himself with Christians generally or with those in one of his churches (which identification obviously expresses Paul's concept of the unity of the church in Christ), see the above studies by Lofthouse, Rigaux, and Stauffer. See also Collange, Enigmes, pp. 25-26, whose otherwise valuable study does not give serious consideration to our question (probably because it is necessarily limited to this small section of Paul's writings), but rather, in a short paragraph, dismisses it. Without textual warrant, and seemingly only on the premise that it has always been considered so throughout Christian history, he assumes that Paul, except where he refers to Christians generally, speaks only in terms of himself. None of the above studies, however, treats the instances from the point of view of Paul's ecumenism, or with reference to their historical situations. We shall examine Paul's use of "I" and "we" in this respect later in this chapter and in chapter 5.

⁶Cf. Rigaux, Thess., p. 79, and ad loc.

⁷Cf. I Thess. 3:2 (see Rigaux, Thess., p. 468); also II Cor. 6:1. In Rom. 16:21, Timothy is Paul's συνεργός. With Timothy, compare Titus, II Cor. 8:23, Paul's συνεργός and κοινωνός, i.e., associate (cf. Moulton-Milligan, p. 351). Both the same and different terms are used for Timothy and for Titus, but it is apparent that the work that each is doing in their respective fields is the same. These seem to be synonymous terms descriptive of function and of relationship to Paul.

⁸On δοῦλος, see Rengstorff, TDNT, II, 273-77. Christians as obligated to Christ for their redemption are his slaves (I Cor. 7:22-23; Rom. 14:18; cf. Rom. 1:14). Hence Paul calls himself and his co-workers slaves of Christ. Ellis would seem to be too precise in using the word to denote a special class of workers (Co-Workers, pp. 443-44, including n. 1, p. 444), for in that case, why are not Silvanus and Titus called δοῦλοι, when Timothy is so called? "Slave", "slave of Christ", "fellow soldier", "fellow worker" may be synonymous terms and may reflect Paul's mood at the moment of

writing, rather than the status or function of the person.

⁹On ἀδελφός see Ellis, Co-Workers, pp. 445-52, also Rigaux, Thess., pp. 467-68, who point out that "brothers" are often fellow labourers, associates, distinct from "brothers" who are general members of the church. The reference in II Thess. 3:6-13 may indeed be to a group of workers singled out from the rest, and the "beloved brothers" of Col. 4:7, 9 part of a group of workers. Yet these letters are earlier than I Cor. 16:15-16, where community workers are ardent Christians who work voluntarily and zealously for the gospel, but who nevertheless are not separated from the wider brotherhood of all believers, the true Israel, in spite of being worthy of respect (cf. Best, Thess., pp. 71, 332-45; also see Rigaux, Thess., pp. 370-71; Hans Freiherr von Soden, "ἀδελφός . . .", TDNT, 1, 144-46; Moule, Col., pp. 45-46, 147). Also, since many of these workers are women (cf. Rom. 16:1; Phil. 4:2-3), this loose term "brothers" may in an epicene way include them.

¹⁰On δούλος, cf. Eduard Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament, trans. Frank Clarke, SBT, No. 32 (London, 1961), pp. 89-104. Ellis, Co-Workers, pp. 441-45, reads into Paul's letters the development which was taking place then and later amongst his competitors, yet the very status distinctions that Paul himself was fighting against. Rather than demonstrating Paul's use of co-workers, Ellis' appeal to post-Pauline works probably reveals rather how quickly and to what extent Paul lost his battle (cf. Houlden, Paul's Letters, pp. 91-92).

¹¹"Working with" and "labouring" refer to "every (one)" πάντι in v. 16 (included with whom are Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus), and to "such ones" in the same verse. The "with" may refer to Paul, or to the members of the church in Corinth, or inclusively, to both. That these words denote a "class" (so Ellis, Co-Workers, p. 441, n. 2) is out of the question, cf. I Cor. 12:25-26.

¹²Cf. Burton, Gal., pp. 360-61; Duncan, Gal., pp. 193-94. The trouble seems to have been in the flesh, 4:12-14 (cf. Schweizer, Jesus, p. 101). The suggestion in this study is that these marks on Paul's body had a special import for the Galatians, reference to which Paul does not make as pointedly anywhere else.

¹³Cf. Moule, Col., pp. 153-55; Marxsen, Introduction, pp. 24-25.

¹⁴Introduction, pp. 77-82; so also Günther Bornkamm, Die Vorgeschichte des sogenannten Zweiten Korintherbriefes, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1961, 2. Abh. (Heidelberg, 1961), pp. 16-23 [reprinted in, idem, Geschichte und Glaube II, Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, LIII (München, 1971), 162-94]; idem, "The History of the Origin of the So-Called Letter to the Corinthians", NTS, VIII (1961-1962) [a résumé of the previous article], 260, 262-63; idem, Paul, pp. 76-77, 244-45; Dieter Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur Religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, XI (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964), pp. 27-29; Walter Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen

(2. Aufl.; Göttingen, 1965), pp. 90-94; Collange, Enigmes, pp. 6-20, 318-19; Weiss, Primitive Christianity, pp. 323-57, especially pp. 342-49; Jack Finegan, "The Original Form of the Pauline Collection", HTR, XLIX (1956), 85-103. For another view, see Barrett, Titus, pp. 13-14, more fully discussed in, idem, A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London, 1973), pp. 5-25. For a résumé of the views held on the unity of II Cor., as well as their own, see further, Héring, II Cor., xi-xv, and Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 211-15.

¹⁵ μήτι ἐπλεονέκτησεν ὑμᾶς Τίτος ; is a question expecting a negative answer. Titus' honesty is well known. The brother is evidently not a regular missionary there, since he is not named. Therefore, one can assume that this was not the first time that Titus had been in Corinth; cf. Plummer, II Cor., pp. 364-65.

¹⁶ According to Barrett, Titus, pp. 7-14 (see also, idem, II Cor., pp. 7-9), Titus did not go to Corinth prior to I Cor., but after Paul's own abortive attempt. Plummer, II Cor., p. 237, however, notes that II Cor. 8:6 has a rare verb, προενήρξατο (cf. Arndt-Gingrich, p. 712, something begun beforehand), which implies a visit to Corinth by Titus before the visit with the severe letter of 7:12. According to the chronology suggested in this study, this means that the beginning of the offering by Titus preceded the severe letter and cannot have begun with it, which in any case would have been strange, even if the embarrassing situation was due to the insult of only one person (an insult so socially severe, however, that Paul had to leave the community). In addition, if upon their arrival back in Ephesus from Jerusalem Paul had immediately sent Titus to Achaia to begin the collection and to help consolidate the churches, Paul may not necessarily have referred, in whatever letter Titus bore, to any of his plan, but would have left that to Titus to work out on the spot.

¹⁷ It can be seen from the circumstances and theology surrounding Paul's collection for Jerusalem, that it was no light matter. Therefore, on the basis of the chronology suggested in this study, Paul let no time elapse--even on his way back to Ephesus--before getting on with what was now his key project. Thus he did not let the Corinthians wait until news of it seeped down to them from Galatia (so Barrett, Titus, pp. 7-10), nor did he delay it until he could collect it merely as a simple gesture of goodwill towards the poor church in the Holy City when he arrived in Corinth at the last moment bound for Jerusalem. As Timothy to Macedonia, so also as soon as possible he sent Titus to Corinth, and possibly others into Asia, to consolidate the communities, to promote the offering, and thereby to unite the churches with Jerusalem. Indeed, this had now become an important symbol of his mission. Cf. E. B. Allo, Saint Paul: Première Épître aux Corinthiens, EtB (Paris, 1934), p. 455, who suggests that Paul might have begun this project in Corinth in his pre-canonical letter.

¹⁸ See the consistent attempt of Hurd and his references to others who attempt to reconstruct the letter from Corinth (I Cor., pp. 61-209, passim), and his own further attempt to reconstruct Paul's previous letter (pp. 213-70). Cf. George G. Findlay, "The Letter of the Corinthian Church to St. Paul", Ex, Ser. 6, I (1900), 401-407.

¹⁹As does Hurd, I Cor., pp. 240-95, passim.

²⁰On τῇ παρουσίᾳ (I Cor. 16:17), see Arndt-Gingrich, p. 635; cf. Barrett, I Cor., p. 395. The visit probably included a self-appointed representation in themselves of those left behind in Corinth. Paul seems to consider it such (cf. 16:15-18). To say, however, with Hurd, I Cor., pp. 49-50, that they are therefore there officially representing Corinth is indeed strange in view (1) of their self-appointment, and (2) of the need for Paul to urge the church to recognize them (vv. 16-18). Thus they can hardly be the bearers either of the Corinthians' letter or of I Corinthians.

²¹Cf. I Cor. 4:17; 16:10. Timothy had already gone when these later sections were written. Reference to Titus' mission may therefore have been in the previous letter. So the absence of his name from I Corinthians is no indication that he was not at work in Corinth.

²²Cf. Hurd, I Cor., pp. 203-206, and Wilfred L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge, 1925), p. 328.

²³That the section 1:10-4:21 is later than 5:1-16:21 is evident in the contrast of 11:18 (where Paul hears of divisions and partly believes the reports, and where the divisions appear merely to be on the basis of class) to 1:11-13 (where the divisions have developed into cliques around several leaders, and which Paul now knows to exist). The divisions, however, may not yet be considered factions (see C. K. Barrett, "Cephas and Corinth", in Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel. Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag, eds. O. Betz, M. Hengel, P. Schmidt (Leiden, 1963), pp. 1-2. Cf. also J. Harrison, "Saint Paul's Letters to the Corinthians", ExT, LXXVII (1965-1966), 285-86, who even suggests that I Cor. 1-4 and II Cor. 10-13 are one letter.

²⁴The methodology of this study brings us to a conclusion similar to that suggested by Harrison, loc. cit., that I Cor. 1-4 and II Cor. 10-13 must be closely related, separated, however, by the painful visit to Corinth. So it is suggested here that I Cor. 1-4 cannot be connected with the letter containing I Cor. 5-16; contra Nils A. Dahl, "Paul and the Church at Corinth According to 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21", in Christian History, Farmer, pp. 316-34, whose attempt to unite the two sections reveals their distinction; note his remark about Hurd (I Cor.) as "hardly able to make anything out of I Cor. 1-4" (p. 316).

²⁵Cf. Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 76-77. On Paul's use of authority, cf. Robert Funk, "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance", in Christian History, Farmer, pp. 264-65.

²⁶Cf. Barrett, Titus, pp. 10-11, and II Cor., pp. 83-93, 206-15. Whatever the "painful letter" suggested by Barrett may have contained, the situation was still severe enough to offer little opportunity for Titus to collect any offering (cf. II Cor. 1:23-2:11). Therefore, contra Barrett, it would seem that II Cor. 10-13 could still be the "painful letter" that Paul refers to. Nor can II Cor. 10-13 come after Paul spent three months in Corinth, as his answer to the rough treatment which caused him to return to Jerusalem via

Macedonia, so Richard Batey, "Paul's Interaction with the Corinthians", JBL, LXXXIV (1965), 139-46, for the enemies at that time were Jews, seemingly not involving Jewish Christians (cf. Acts 20:3).

²⁷Cf. supra, p. 56.

²⁸See The New Testament Background: Selected Documents, ed., with introductions, by C. K. Barrett (London, 1961), pp. 48-49; Deissmann, Paul, pp. 261-86, especially p. 281; Charlesworth, Gaius, p. 682, n. 2; cf. Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 104-11, especially p. 111, and Dockx, Chronologie, pp. 277-78 (who favour May-May).

²⁹See the discussion about this trial (apart from his chronology) by M. Goguel, "La vision de Paul à Corinthe et sa comparution devant Gallion", RHPR, XII (1932), 321-33. Who was the offender (II Cor. 2:2, 5-8)? Sosthenes (Acts 18:17)? Who the offender was of course remains unknown. But it would rather seem that it was because Sosthenes was a Pauline Christian ruler of the synagogue, that he therefore became the natural target for the revenge of non-Christian, Zealot Jews who may have formed a coalition with an influential, Zealot-fearing Judaizer against Paul (cf. Acts 18:12).

³⁰Cf. supra, p. 46, including n. 35; also cf. Ogg, op. cit., p. 35, and Dockx, Chronologie, pp. 299-300, who date Paul's first journey to Jerusalem in 37.

³¹Cf. Acts 20:16; also cf. Acts 24:27, and for arguments dating Festus' replacement of Felix as procurator in 55, see Lake, Chronology, pp. 466-67; Knox, Chapters, p. 83; Haenchen, Acts, pp. 68-71; Dockx, Chronologie, pp. 287-91; cf. also Barrett, Rom., p. 5.

³²For their arguments see the references noted above, and for a thorough review of them, see Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 140-70. Because he basis his chronology on Acts, Ogg himself favours 59.

³³See supra, Introduction, passim, especially pp. 7-12.

³⁴See supra, pp. 37-38, including nn. 16 and 17.

³⁵See supra, pp. 45-46, including n. 35.

³⁶See supra, pp. 108-109, including n. 25.

³⁷So Osborne, Silent Years, p. 62.

³⁸See Fourteen Years Later, pp. 341-49, and Pauline Chronology, pp. 15-29.

³⁹Chapters, p. 78.

⁴⁰See Moulton-Milligan, p. 536.

⁴¹See supra, pp. 104-109.

⁴²So Enslin, Reapproaching Paul, pp. 54-55.

⁴³Cf. Dibelius, Paul, p. 67.

⁴⁴Co-Workers, so by his chart, p. 438, and p. 441, n. 6. See Hermann W. Beyer, "διακονέω, . . .", TDNT, II, 88-93. See infra, n. 48.

⁴⁵The one who expressly served to demonstrate Paul's goodwill concerning the offering was appointed by the churches (plural, cf. II Cor. 8:19), so probably the churches (plural) in Paul's provinces (cf. Georgi, Geschichte der Kollekte, pp. 54-55), rather than by the church (singular) in Jerusalem (contra Nickle, Collection, pp. 18-22, 127-28). Héring, II Cor., p. 63, rightly perceives that Paul had planned the collection "with all the precautions". The use of the brethren was part of that planning (see Plummer, II Cor., pp. 247-51). There is no textual evidence for saying that the brethren represented the Macedonian churches, contra Plummer, p. 251, Héring, p. 62, and Barrett, II Cor., p. 228 (but see Plummer, op. cit., p. 255, Héring, op. cit., p. 65, and Barrett, op. cit., p. 230), but rather it would seem that 9:3-4 negates any possibility that the brother who was appointed by the churches was a Macedonian appointee.

⁴⁶Cf. Rigaux, Thess., pp. 576-79, who argues for a differentiation of groups according to function and for a certain functional but not technically authoritative hierarchy; and Ellis, Co-Workers, pp. 445-52, passim, who regards "brothers" as a hierarchical term. But this can hardly be the case; see Gnllka, Geistliches Amt, pp. 240-45, on the beginnings of a Greek-type "Kollegium", not started by Paul in Philippi, but developing spontaneously. How far it had developed is, of course, problematical. Cf. also Georgi, Gegner des Paulus, pp. 34-36. On "brothers" in I Thess. 4:1 and 5:12, 14, see Schweizer, Church Order, p. 103, including n. 394; Frame, Thess., p. 196. Rigaux, Thess., p. 575, calls attention to the Hebrew wisdom literary forms in which Paul was accomplished. Parallelism was an important part of that form. In 5:12-22 the three participals connected by "and" in v. 12 are parallel forms which should represent parallel functions. Thus προϊσταμένους between κοπιῶντας and νοουθετοῦντας is of the same order as the other two. The first is "labouring", the last, "admonishing" or "instructing". So the middle term is less likely to be of an executive nature, but rather a service rendered like the others, e.g., "caring for" or "being concerned about" (Arndt-Gingrich, p. 714; cf. Dobschütz, Thess., ad loc.; Moulton-Milligan, p. 541). Consequently, 5:12-13 compares well with I Cor. 16:15-16, 18b. It is doubtful that the organization between the two communities varied greatly. See Frame, Thess., pp. 192-94; Schweizer, op. cit., passim (sections on Paul), especially pp. 198, 204-205; and Best, Thess., pp. 223-29.

⁴⁷Cf. de Boer, Imitation, p. 119, and Houlden, Paul's Letters, p. 91, who also use the word "team" as a description of the nature of the corporate group.

⁴⁸In I Thess. 3:2, the unusual construction may be due to Paul's calling attention to the team's oneness with Timothy in the work which they jointly share as God's work. The variants are: συνεργόν τοῦ Θεοῦ D*33(arm)Ambst Pelag; συνεργόν; διακονον τ. Θ. XAP 424^c 1739 vg sy^h co; διακ. τ. Θ. καὶ συνεργ. ημων κτ pl sy^p5; διακ. κ. συν. τ. Θ. G. The first, the harder reading, is to be

preferred; see Rigaux, Thess., pp. 466-68; Frame, Thess., pp. 126-27; James Moffatt, "The First and Second Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians", EGT (London, 1910), p. 31. In I Thess. 3:2, συνεργόν may refer back to the genitive, "our", giving the sense of "God's worker labouring with us", or "our co-worker in God's employ", as in I Cor. 3:9 (so Barrett, I Cor., p. 86; cf. Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., pp. 58-59). Their oneness has its origin in God's common calling. Cf. Best, Thess., pp. 132-33; and Bruce M. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration (2d ed.; Oxford, 1968), pp. 240-42.

⁴⁹Compulsion underlies Paul's figure of δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, a term shocking to Greek ears (cf. F. W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, BNTC [2d ed.; London, 1969], pp. 50-51), but in the O. T. connoting voluntary submission. Again the origin of the service lies beyond man in Christ, who is served alike by each of the members of the team. With Paul, however, the idea of δοῦλος goes beyond voluntary submission. It denotes something that he must do, for he is claimed by Christ. See Gerhard Sass, "Zur Bedeutung von δοῦλος bei Paulus", ZNW, XL (1941), 24-32, who suggests that it means that God acts through man, entrusting his work to him; cf. I Cor. 9:17b.

⁵⁰See supra, n. 5, for a summary of the debate on this question.

⁵¹See Rigaux, Thess., p. 474, and Frame, Thess., ad loc.; contra Dobschütz, Thess., ad loc., Dibelius, Thess., ad loc., and Moffatt's translation and commentary, Thess., p. 31.

⁵²This would seem to be the force of κ'αγὺ . . . (v. 5), i.e., emphasizing the corporate nature of Timothy's visit; cf. Rigaux, Thess., p. 474.

⁵³Cf. Barrett, I Cor., p. 76.

⁵⁴See Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., pp. 83-84, who indicate that "us" means those who taught them what they know of the gospel and refers to the apostles (probably Paul and Apollos, so Barrett, I Cor., p. 108); but of course the apostles who actually did the ground work as far as Paul is concerned were his own colleagues, Timothy and Silvanus (cf. I Cor. 3:10; II Cor. 1:19). In the contrast that Paul makes between himself and the new-comers, his corporate identity with his team should also be supposed. Cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Apostles Before and During Paul's Time", trans. Manfred Kwiran and W. Ward Gasque, in Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday, ed. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (Exeter, Devon, 1970), pp. 295-96, including n. 1, p. 295.

⁵⁵See supra, n. 14. Bornkamm, Vorgeschichte, pp. 22-23, and Georgi, Geener, pp. 16-24, claim that different opponents are in the background of II Cor. 2:14-7:4 than those of II Cor. 10-13. Georgi, p. 23, including n. 4, especially notes the difference in Paul's use of "we" and "I" in the two sections.

⁵⁶Dibelius (Thess., Excursus, pp. 9-10) shows that while the

Corinthian parallels to I Thess. 2:3 ff. have similarities, their differences are greater; for the Thessalonian opponents were from outside the church and were not getting a hearing, whereas the Corinthian opponents were within the church and so were disturbing Paul's work.

⁵⁷Cf. Plummer, II Cor., p. 80, who says that "The plur. 'hearts' probably implies that other teachers are included" with Paul. On the reading, καρδίαις ἡμῶν (v. 2), see also Collange, Enigmes, pp. 46-47; but see Héring, II Cor., p. 21, n. 2, and Barrett, II Cor., pp. 96, n. 3, and 107-108, who prefer the reading καρδίαις ὑμῶν.

⁵⁸Cf. Plummer, II Cor., p. 85. Paul's "sufficiency" is referred back to a specific time (aorist, ἐκάνωσαν), i.e., to his conversion (cf. Col. 1:12). But as Plummer indicates, the "we" throughout is inclusive. If so, then Paul must not only be referring to his own qualifications but to his associates' as well. It can hardly be inclusive in one part of the section and, without reason, become epistolary in a succeeding phrase.

⁵⁹Cf. Héring, II Cor., p. 46, who seems to imply that ambassadorship belongs only to Paul, which is not what the text suggests. II Cor. 5:16 ff. continues the explanation and defence of the team's ministry. (Paul focuses attention upon the team in several places, cf., e.g., Kijne, We, p. 178 on 5:20; Barrett, 2 Cor 11.13, p. 385, n. 4, on 4:1 ff.) It may be true, as R. H. Strachan, The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, MNTC (London, 1935), p. 119, says, that nowhere more than in this passage does Paul indicate that his conversion experience is the origin of his Christian thinking; and so, to a degree, Moffatt may be justified in changing "us" to "me", i.e., to "he entrusted me". So, too, as a reference to Paul alone, cf. Collange, Enigmes, pp. 266-80. But to emphasize this detracts from an important note that Paul wishes to convey, that is, that his experience is one that he shares in common with all other apostles including his own co-workers. Cf. Plummer, II Cor., pp. 189-90, and his comments on the fourth way of reading συνεργοῦντες, which, he declares, if the "we" is a genuine "we", does not make sense, i.e., "co-operating with ourselves". Yet this reflexive meaning is exactly the sense in which any team work must be taken, i.e., working together, or co-operating with one another as a team (cf. I Cor. 12-14)--so too in Paul's team of missionizing colleagues. See examples in Moulton-Milligan, p. 605.

⁶⁰Both Héring, II Cor., p. 49, and Filson, II Cor., p. 351, refer to the fact that Paul's wording of 6:11 reflects the LXX Psalm 118:32b, ὅταν ἐπλάτυνας τὴν καρδίαν μου. If so, why would Paul change the μου to ἡμῶν, reflect the substitution again in 7:3, and underline the change by using the singular λέγω in a clearly personal interjection when he wants to refer to himself or to his own part in it? It seems clear, therefore, that the plurals are genuine, and that throughout Paul has been defending, describing, and exalting the ministry of his corporate group of associates who function as a unit.

⁶¹Héring, II Cor., p. 69, claims that the apostle in II Cor.

10-13 writes for himself alone, and any plural pronoun is taken to be one of authority or authorship. But on what authority can this be said? Paul may be fighting his own battle as the leader of the team, but it is in the end the team's battle that he fights, as he categorically states throughout the letter, even as he draws them into the fray to defend them. When Paul wants to emphasize his own authority or authorship, he does so directly, cf. II Cor. 10:1; 13:1-3a; I Thess. 2:18; II Thess. 3:17.

⁶²The tribulations of 1:4-5 seem to be shared by all Christians (cf. v. 7; also I Thess. 2:14; 3:2-4); but specifically Paul is writing about his team's sufferings and joys for the Corinthians (cf. v. 6). Not only do vv. 19-22 involve others besides Paul in the sufferings recorded in the previous verses, but the historical situation does so even more. Titus and Timothy and the brothers (I Cor. 16:10-11; II Cor. 12:17-19; 7:13-15; 8:6) had, except for Paul's one painful visit there, been more intimately engaged in the work in the community itself, its hostility, its contentions, and its rewarding solution. When Paul has identified himself with them in the struggles, he could hardly, now that things are better (thanks to a great extent to their personal suffering and hard work), drop them from this passage recalling the experiences.

Paul also uses the plural with regard to sufferings that he endured in Asia (v. 8). Riots of any kind involve the lives and threat to life of far more than one. Claudius' edict, e.g., was not against one person or because of one. Whether the riot referred to in Acts 19:23-41 is in Paul's mind cannot, of course, be said. But there is far more linguistic, circumstantial, and historical justification for considering that even the threat of death here is in the plural, than that Paul speaks only of himself.

⁶³Some (cf. Barrett, Titus, pp. 8-9, including n. 25, cf. also II Cor., pp. 11, 96-99, 206-207) object to II Cor. 2:13 and 7:5 being continuous, because of the use of the singular in 2:13 and the plural in 7:5. But 2:13 is related to the personal attack upon Paul and his own defence, while 7:5 indicates the involvement of others. This change from singular to plural is no more inexplicable here than elsewhere. Even if chs. 1-9 should be a unity, the change would be disturbing.

⁶⁴Cf. Plummer, II Cor., p. 2, who suggests that Timothy was ill-treated in Corinth so that Paul makes no mention of the visit in II Cor. Then, why include his name in the address? It is more likely, as J. E. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays (2d ed.; London, 1904), pp. 276-81, suggests, that Timothy never arrived in Corinth. We suggest in addition that it is possible that the brethren mentioned in I Cor. 16:11 not only are expected with Timothy from Corinth but also may have accompanied him throughout Macedonia on a mission to foster the collection. For 1) they are now going to Corinth on the collection mission and could have done so with Timothy in Macedonia; 2) they are tested and true, and would have become so after the Macedonian experience, especially since the Macedonian offering was so successfully gathered (cf. 8:1-5). Who, then, better than they to be appointed by the churches in Ephesus after their return from Macedonia to go with Paul on a similar effort to Corinth, especially when special help was so much needed? Also, inasmuch as 8:23 gives the impression that only two brethren were travelling with Paul, it

would seem to follow that Timothy and the brethren travelling with him had reached Ephesus before Paul started on his journey. If that should be so, then Timothy and these brethren may have returned to Ephesus before Titus was sent back to Corinth with the severe letter, and so may have shared in the discussion and group action which sent him there.

⁶⁵In II Thess. 2:13 the "we" is emphatic, ἡμεῖς δὲ ὀφείλομεν, and cannot be avoided (cf. also I Thess. 2:13).

⁶⁶This passage may throw further light upon the beginning of the church in the district of Colossae and upon Paul's early relations with Philemon. Epaphras (v. 7) is designated as τοῦ ἀγαπῆτοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν, which associates him with the group in Ephesus which in some way includes Paul--but whether as a friendly neighbouring colleague or as a full member cannot yet be said. If, however, in the following clause, ἡμῶν (so p⁴⁶χ*ABD*^o G pm), instead of the not so well attested ὑμῶν (so CKLP al lat sy^s), is read, then Epaphras could well be one of the circle in Ephesus who on their behalf went to Colossae to found and to develop the church there. In that case, when Paul first arrived in Asia, mission work may not have reached as far as Colossae. If so, then there is no reason why Paul, perceiving that no church had been established in the region, perhaps by working through his own converts, i.e., Philemon and household, may not even have been the one who urged the Ephesian circle (whose immediate responsibility it might have been, and not Paul's) to missionize the Lycus valley. If so, then Epaphras would have reason to report to the circle.

⁶⁷Cf. Burton, Gal., pp. 8-10; Duncan, Gal., pp. 9-10; and Lightfoot, Gal., pp. 72-73. There may have been, however, one in their number who had been there with Paul on the second visit, namely, Titus. The preaching of the gospel by both of them at that time could also have been in the background of Paul's mind in v. 8.

⁶⁸On fellow workers, see Ellis, Co-Workers, pp. 440-441, especially n. 3, p. 440. Except for one reference in III John 8, every occurrence of συνεργός in the N. T. is found in Paul's correspondence, and there to every church except Galatia and Rome (ch. 16 as part of the letter to Rome is questionable), thus in every letter to every church in which the team was involved in missionizing, i.e., Rom. 16:3, 9, 21; I Cor. 3:9 (participial form, 16:16; in meaning, also 16:10); II Cor. 1:24 (omitted by Ellis on his chart, p. 438 [because it is not connected with a specific name?]; nevertheless it covers all Paul's team that had anything to do with missionizing Achaia, so it covers any letter contained within the canonical I-II Cor.); 8:23; Phil. 2:25; 4:3; Col. 4:11; I Thess. 3:2; and Phlm. 1, 24.

⁶⁹Cf. Plummer, II Cor., pp. 1-2, Hering, II Cor., p. 1, Rengstorff, ἀπόστολος, p. 423, Schmithals, Office of Apostle, p. 23, who claim that Paul avoids calling Timothy an apostle. It is a fact that in the addresses Paul calls attention to his own apostleship and refers to Timothy or to others as "brothers". But he does include Timothy and Silvanus, and indeed others who work as missionaries of the gospel, as apostles (see I Thess. 2:6 [Greek text, vv. 6-7] which is a clear reference to Timothy and Silvanus; also Rom.

16:7; I Cor. 4:9--a reference not to the Jerusalem apostles, but to his own team members; cf. also Phil. 2:25, which, however, as Rengstorff, loc. cit., indicates, may merely be a reference to Epaphroditus' appointment by the church to serve Paul). See Frame, Thess., pp. 99-100; Rigaux, Thess., pp. 156-57; also cf. Best, Thess., p. 100. It is true that Paul equates his apostleship with that of the Twelve; but by so doing he is not concerned with rank in the brotherhood, but with the validity of his gospel, and the necessity to establish that validity which is in question and needs to be defended against false gospels proclaimed in the name of the Twelve by false apostles. Paul not only claims that his apostleship came from a call from the Risen Christ, but he is probably "the first to trace the apostolic commission back to God himself" (so Rengstorff, op. cit., p. 438; cf. also Hay, Authority, pp. 40-44). In the latter sense, Timothy and many others are as much apostles as Paul himself, contra Schmithals, loc. cit., and Rengstorff, op. cit., p. 423; cf. Houlden, Paul's Letters, p. 91-92.

⁷⁰The same prerogative possessed by God to elect a people (cf. Bring, Paul and the O.T., pp. 41-42), would seem to Paul to be equally possessed by God to call apostles or missionaries (cf. Schlier, Gal., pp. 53-54; Filson, II Cor., pp. 305-309; Craig, I Cor., pp. 45-46).

⁷¹Paul does not refer to the 500 as apostles. See Barrett, I Cor., pp. 342-43; Rengstorff, op. cit., pp. 430-37; cf. Schmithals, Office of Apostles, pp. 22-24.

⁷²Cf. Plummer, II Cor., pp. 184-85. An ambassador, as a legate, is commissioned by the one sending him to represent him; thus "ambassador" and "apostle" (in its wider sense) are synonymous terms (cf. Adolf Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan [rev. ed.; London, 1927], p. 379; also Käsemann, Beginnings, pp. 42-43).

⁷³Except for his detection of status and structural divisions in what seem clearly to be functional terms, Ellis, Co-Workers, pp. 445-52, is right in his observation that there are groups who are associated in working together in the mission of the church, both locally and on an itinerant basis.

⁷⁴For a discussion of Paul's trade, see Joachim Jeremias, "Zöllner und Sünder", ZNW, XXX (1931), 296 (chart), 298-99 [now in, idem, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period, trans. F. H. and C. H. Clave (London, 1969), pp. 303-12], followed by Haenchen, Acts, p. 534, n. 3; Wilhelm Michaelis, "σκηνοπολις", TDNT, VII, 393-94; cf. Joseph Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, trans. William F. Stinespring (London, 1944), p. 308, n. 29. As Knox, Chapters, p. 76, notes, "the proper translation of the Greek term is uncertain".

⁷⁵Ὁ καὶ ἄπαι καὶ δὶς, see Rigaux, Thess., p. 461, who takes it to mean "several", i.e., the number not determined; see also Best, Thess., p. 126, who says, "'twice' would be too weak a rendering and 'repeatedly' too strong". There is no reason, there-

fore, in view of Paul's avowed policy, to exaggerate this into the impression that Paul was receiving help almost constantly both in Corinth and in Thessalonica, as David L. Dungan, The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life (Oxford, 1971), pp. 29, 38, implies.

⁷⁶Philippi may have been a prosperous city and part of a province far richer than Achaia (see Oertel, Economic Unification, pp. 402-403; Mommsen, Provinces, pp. 298-302; Paul E. Davies, "The Macedonian Scene of Paul's Journeys", BA, XXVI [1963], 91-106), but that in itself does not necessarily mean that the churches were thereby richer. Against II Cor. 11:8 must be placed II Cor. 8:1-2. Concerning manufacturing trades, Achaia was nearly destitute; yet Corinth as an important port flourished in commerce and in banking. So some of the people in the church itself may have been richer than those in Macedonia; note the important people mentioned in Rom. 16; I Cor. 1:1; 16:15. Even though these may have been limited in number (cf. I Cor. 1:26-29), yet evidently some had enough means to be conscious of class distinctions, cf. I Cor. 11:18-22 (also Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., p. 239). Thus the spirit in which a church gave may have been more important to Paul than its economic state, i.e., whether the members gave in the true spirit of $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\iota\varsigma$ for the mission of the church; cf. the spirit of I Thess. 1:8 with the spirit reflected in I Cor. 9-11 (the background for chs. 12-14). See also Thornton, Common Life, pp. 392, 334-45.

⁷⁷Contra Smith, Pauline Problems, p. 122, n. 10, and Dungan, Sayings, p. 38, Paul cannot be charged here with duplicity. In II Thess. 3:8 he does not intimate that he and his team received no aid. Rather he says that they did not receive their bread as a free gift from the Thessalonians. This could be taken in two ways. Either the bread that they ate was their right (cf. I Cor. 9:3-14)--but this is to be rejected because of I Thess. 2:9 and I Cor. 9:15-18; or that they paid for it out of funds earned by their own manual toil or from funds provided by the Philippians (cf. Phil. 4:16). Gifts from the Philippians were evidently sent whenever Paul was in need (cf. II Cor. 11:9).

⁷⁸Greeks despised teachers who toiled for their living, which is a possible reason why the anticipation of the Parousia gave added incentive for the local workers to sponge on others in the church at Thessalonica, in spite of Paul's instructions and example. But Paul, a Jew, was taught industry and economic independence from childhood, cf. Prov. 6:6-11; 10:4, 26; 12:27; 19:15; 20:4; 21:25; 22:29; 24:30-34; 28:19 (doubtless he was familiar with these proverbs, cf. Rom. 12:20 and Prov. 25:21-22).

⁷⁹Cf. Plummer, II Cor., p. 305; Barrett, I Cor., pp. 207-16. Wages mean subjection, cf. I Thess. 2:3-6. As a slave of Christ, only Christ is Lord, cf. I Cor. 7:22-23. So Paul can be all things "to all the lot of them" (as Barrett, p. 215, translates it); cf. Bornkamm, Paul, p. 174, and Best, Thess., p. 337.

In addition to those proposed above, another explanation of Paul's refusal to accept help from the Corinthians and of their seemingly inexplicable reproach of Paul for his refusal of aid from them could well be as follows. As discussed in ch. 3, the Macedo-

nian churches were Gentile churches, not Jewish, and so they were not synagogue orientated or connected with Jewish community life and customs. On the other hand, the Corinthian church was partly Jewish, possibly predominantly so; and from the evidence already noted, the church was probably connected with the synagogue and with the Jewish community and customs. In Macedonia, Christian people from a pagan background could help Paul, because there would be no obligations binding Paul to pagan laws and cults, and of course, in the Macedonian situation, not to Jewish laws and cult practices. The case, however, was entirely different in Achaia where a Jewish guild and the Jewish sense of kinship, loyalty, and fraternity would oblige the Jewish Christians and community to help Paul whenever he was in need (cf. Guignebert, Jewish World, p. 221; and Salo Wittmayer Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, Volume I: Ancient Times, Part I [2d ed., rev.; New York, 1952], pp. 257-58), with the consequent rightful and natural expectation of obligatory reciprocal loyalty on the part of Paul to Jewish cultic demands and community laws. Thus two things are understandable: 1) Paul's refusal of aid from Corinth in order to remain independent for the sake of his gospel, and 2) the Jews' reaction to Paul's refusal of help as a rebuff to their ancient mores of solidarity, and as an insult to themselves. The newly arrived Judaizers realized their opportunity to make capital out of this situation.

⁸⁰Cf. Acts. 18:1-3; 18:18; supra, nn. 42 and 43 to ch. 2. As was common in the Roman capitalistic system, Aquila and Prisca could have been well-to-do entrepreneurs with establishments in several cities, including Rome, Corinth, and Ephesus (see Oertel, Economic Unification, pp. 387-91, 413-15, 422; M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire [2d ed. rev. by P. M. Fraser, 2 vols.; Oxford, 1957], I, 90-94; cf. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization, p. 339). and business relationships with sources of supply, e.g., with Philemon (cf. Phlm. v. 17, κοινωνόν, and vv. 18-19a, ἐλάλογα, and see Moulton-Milligan, pp. 351, 204).

⁸¹But see Weiss, erste Kor., p. 238; Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., p. 186; Dungan, Sayings, p. 8.

⁸²On "night and day" see Rigaux, Thess., pp. 423-24; Bailey, Thess., pp. 273-74; Best, Thess., p. 103.

⁸³See Edgar J. Goodspeed, "Thoebe's Letter of Introduction", HTR, XLIV (1951), 55-57; Barrett, I Cor., p. 391; Dungan, Sayings, pp. 45, 67-68, 79; cf. the practice of the Essenes, as reported by Josephus, B.J. II, 124-27.

⁸⁴See references in n. 80 above on the use of technicians, salesmen, etc. travelling between branches of a business enterprise such as Prisca and Aquila may have been engaged in. If such was the case with Paul's team, then these team members could have been engaged in activities related to their business in these cities, while Paul, based in Ephesus, directed both the mission of the church and the business interests of Aquila and Prisca in the whole area; and the total group may have devoted their business to the mission of the church as an example of the implications of κοινωνία as it is to be effected in the body of Christ (cf. Rom. 16:3-4; see Best, Thess., pp. 332-38).

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

¹See Rigaux, Thess., pp. 79-80.

²In these asides Paul calls attention to his own participation in the topic being considered (cf. Dodd, Rom., p. 107). But the abrupt changes in 2:18 from the 1st plural to the 1st singular back to the 1st plural indicate that it is the whole group that wants to return to Thessalonica, cf. Rigaux, Thess., p. 461, and Best, Thess., p. 126. The reason why Paul prefers to disappear into the group would seem to be deeper than modesty, or even the plural of apostleship or of witness, which Rigaux suggests (pp. 79-80). Rather, in Paul this solidarity has become the plural of community and equality now existing in the church.

³On the subject of autographic conclusions and the use of amanuensis, see Frame, Thess., pp. 311-12; Rigaux, Thess., p. 718; Cf. Gordon J. Bahr, "Paul and Letter Writing in the Fifth [First] Century", CBQ, XXVIII (1966), 465-77; E. Iliff Robson, "Composition and Dictation in N. T. Books", JTS, XVIII (1917), 291.

⁴Partaking in the body of Christ (I Cor. 10:16-17) makes the church a unity expressed in the unity of the one loaf (cf. Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., pp. 214-15; see Ernst Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes, SBT, No. 41 [London, 1964], pp. 109-10; Allo, I Cor., pp. 240-41; Best, One Body, pp. 106-107; Barrett, I Cor., pp. 233-35; Hering, I Cor., p. 95). But the Corinthians, by their allegiances to individual apostles, are attempting to divide Christ. I Cor. 1:13a denies the possibility of this; consequently, those who persist in this are demonstrating that they are not the body of Christ--an eschatological fact that will be made clear on the day of judgment when the false and the true are separated (I Cor. 11:19; cf. II Cor. 5:10; see Barrett, I Cor., p. 262; Käsemann, op. cit., pp. 119-27). On σχισματα and ἐριδες see Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., pp. 10-11; Allo, I Cor., p. 7; Hering, I Cor., pp. 4-5; Barrett, I Cor., pp. 41-46, and idem, Cephas, pp. 1-3; Munk, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 136-39.

⁵For the significance of "ὅτι ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπερ ἃ γέγραπται" see Barrett, I Cor., pp. 105-107; M. D. Hooker, "'Beyond the Things Which Are Written': An Examination of I Cor. iv. 6", NTS, X (1963-1964), 127-32.

⁶Cf. Schmithals, Office of Apostle, pp. 40-41; also Sevenster, Paul and Seneca, p. 19.

⁷See Barrett, I Cor., pp. 200-201; also idem, Pillar Apostles, pp. 18-19; Allo, I Cor., p. 209; Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., pp. 177-78. It is interesting to note that in each question that Paul asks, he uses οὐ except for the one referring to seeing "the Lord". For that he uses the more intensive οὐχί, which therefore is the one which points to the special qualification of an apostle, upon which the others hinge as far as his opponents are concerned. This clinches his argument against his opposition. As far as is known, no other member of Paul's own team of fellow workers (i.e., Timothy and Titus) could say as much, though accord-

ing to Acts 15:22 Silvanus might be excepted (cf. Schmithals, op. cit., pp. 65-67). Though his workers do not receive from him their call or commission to missionize, they can receive from him whatever authorization is deemed necessary according to the specifications of apostleship put forward by his opponents. Then v. 3 refers not ahead to what follows, but back to the opposition implied in the preceding defence, vv. 1-2 (so also Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., p. 179; but see Allo, I Cor., p. 210), but for Paul it is the last of the four considerations, viz., that the Corinthians are his work in the Lord, which is the decisive one (cf. Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 20-22).

⁸ According to the chronology suggested in this study, the arrival of Peter to disturb Paul's church so soon after the agreements arrived at in Jerusalem seems unlikely. Peter's moving away from table fellowship with the Gentiles at Antioch in no way implies that he set up a rival group or began touring Paul's territory with that in mind. Gal. 2 (which at least was written no earlier than I Cor.) does not say nor imply this. Yet Paul makes no allusions anywhere to Peter having been in Corinth prior to the Jerusalem conference. For further discussion of this question of opponents in Pauline territories, see in addition to those referred to in nn. 19 and 25 to ch. 3, W. Knox, Church of Jerusalem, pp. 309-28, including nn. at end; Schmithals, Gnosis in Korinth, pp. 106-109; idem, "Die Irrlehrer des Philipperbriefes", in idem, Paulus und die Gnostiker: Untersuchungen zu den kleinen Paulusbriefen, Theologische Forschung, Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre, XXXV (Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1965), pp. 47-87; Ernst Käsemann, Die Legitimität des Apostels: Eine Untersuchung zu II Korinther 10-13, 1st published in ZNW, XLI (1942), 33-71, also in Sonderausgabe, Reihe "Libelli", Band XXXIII (Darmstadt, 1964), pp. 8-37; Koester, Philippians III; Georgi, Gegner des Paulus; Derk William Oostendorp, Another Jesus: A Gospel of Jewish-Christian Superiority in II Corinthians, Academisch Proefschrift, Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam (Kampen, 1967), pp. 7-88; Ellis, Those of the Circumcision, pp. 390-99; G. W. MacRae, "Anti-Dualistic Polemic in 2 Cor. 4,6?", StEv, IV, 420-31; Collange, Enigmes, pp. 15-20, 320-24; C. K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians", NTS, XVII (1970-1971), 233-54; idem, Cephas; idem, II Cor., pp. 28-32; Gerhard Friedrich, "Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief", in Abraham unser Vater, Betz, pp. 181-215. Also for their possible background, see Kurt Schubert, "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts", pp. 119-21, and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and Their Literature", pp. 210-12, 230-31, in Scrolls, Stendahl.

⁹ One of the issues bothering Corinth appears to be the growing power of the Jerusalem hierarchy and its use of the Apostolate of the Twelve and Peter's primary position in it (I Cor. 15:5; Gal. 1:18; 2:9; cf. I Cor. 3:11); see Hering, II Cor., pp. 107-11; Barrett, I Cor., pp. 87-88; cf. idem, Pillar Apostles, pp. 18-19; also see Manson, Studies, pp. 194-97; S. G. F. Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the effects of the Jewish overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity (London, 1951), pp. 50-51; Benoit, Qumran, p. 16; and cf. Johnson, Manual of Discipline, pp. 133-34.

¹⁰ Here for Paul lies the essence of the matter, the function

of being a witness to the resurrection. Such people stand at the beginning of the eschatological age and witness to that opening event, which, however, gives them no further rights or authority in the church (see Barrett, Pillar Apostles, pp. 18-19; idem, I Cor., pp. 70-76, 99-100; Schmithals, Office of Apostle, pp. 21-42).

¹¹Cf. Delcor, Courts, pp. 79-80.

¹²In the O. T. all Israelites are "brothers", but also wherever there is a bond of social unity there is brotherhood. Cf. also Qumran 1 QS VI, 22; CD VII, 1, 2; VIII, 6; but see 1 QM XIII, 1; XV, 4, 7; 1 QSa I, 18, where priests are referred to as brothers but fighting men are not, a distinction between classes that Paul does not make. It is true that Paul has his circle of workers with whom he is very intimate, and that he often refers to them as "brothers", so Ellis, Co-Workers, pp. 445-48; but with his emphasis upon equality-without-distinction in the church it is doubtful whether by the use of the term he was in any way segregating one group from another. The workers, including Paul himself, though having a special function to perform, were not separated from nor raised above the congregation of the true Israel (cf. I Cor. 1:29-30; 3:22).

¹³Cf. C. H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach", BJRL, XVII (1933), 102-104 [also in idem, Studies, pp. 67-82]. The present study suggests that this psychological change, called by Dodd a second conversion, is understandable; first, because after II Cor. 10-13, Paul has won his case, and he can therefore afford to change his tone. Second, the experience may have taught him how to manage people, especially in money matters. In this case, it taught him how to use a better fund-raising psychology (see Hering, II Cor., p. 60, on 8:8). Third, Paul was forced to boast, and was in agony because he would rather have his mission stand on the truth of its message, not on externals. Dodd interprets Paul's boasting as born of a desire to excel, and says that Paul at least had grace enough to admit that he was being a fool. According to the above, this seems to be a misinterpretation.

¹⁴For views on the unity of II Cor., see n. 14 to ch. 4.

¹⁵Cf. Köhler, Hebrew Man, pp. 122-24.

¹⁶See Bornkamm, Vorgeschichte, pp. 16-23; idem, Paul, p. 246; also Marxsen, Introduction, p. 90; and Joachim Gnllka, "2 Cor. 6:14-7:1 in the light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", in Paul and Qumran, Murphy-O'Connor, pp. 56-68.

¹⁷If placing 2:14-7:4 this early is feasible, then it shatters some views of those who seek to trace lines of development in Paul's concepts, e.g., as that of the resurrection, which C. F. D. Moule ("St Paul and Dualism: The Pauline Conception of Resurrection", NIS, XII [1965-1966], 106-23) admits is slight between I Cor. 15 and II Cor. 5; cf. that of the development of thought in Paul argued by Charles H. Buck, "The Date of Galatians", JBL, LXX (1951), 113-22; and Buck and Taylor, Saint Paul, pp. 53-102, especially on resurrection, pp. 100-101. Bruce, Galatian Problems 4, pp. 258-61, rightly objects to this method of chronological analysis irrespec-

tive of the possibilities of the situations concerned.

¹⁸In II Cor. 11:7-10 Paul emphasizes that while he was in need in Corinth, he received aid from the Macedonians, not from the local inhabitants. Perhaps an additional reason was that he had appreciated the impoverished circumstances of many of them (cf. I Cor. 11:18, 21-22), a condition which in part seems to have been relieved (the wording of II Cor. 8:11-14 is peculiar, cf. vv. 11b, 12, and v. 14--the first implies poor people, the second more prosperous ones). This mixed financial condition may also be why Paul has to be careful how he prods them for a substantial gift, and also why in Achaia the opposition was particularly sensitive to money matters, which he may have intensified if he had previously offended them when they were poorer by not accepting their generosity offered in the spirit of Jewish fraternity (cf. II Cor. 11:7, 11).

¹⁹So Rengstorff, ἀπόστολος, p. 423; Schmithals, Office of Apostle, pp. 23, 67, including n. 39. What Apollos does in Asia, Paul never says, but in this text Paul does not describe Apollos' work in Achaia as that of one who plants (i.e., the apostle's peculiar function; cf. Schmithals, op. cit., p. 44), but rather that of one who waters after the planting is done. Yet see I Cor. 4:1 and 9, which refer to Apollos as an apostle and which would therefore imply that at least in Asia he performed the function of an apostle. This would tend to bear out this study's suggestion that apostleship for Paul is a description of function, not of status. Cf. Ellis, Co-Workers, p. 439, including n. 8, also p. 445, n. 1; and Héring, II Cor., p. 110.

²⁰Cf. Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., p. 58; Allo, I Cor., p. 57; Barrett, I Cor., p. 86. Regarding rewards according to one's work, it would seem that here Paul is not now introducing wage gradations in worldly terms, but is referring to the proportional satisfaction that one has of seeing permanent results taking place in the structure of the community being built relative to the quality of the work that one has done.

²¹So to this extent, contra Ellis, Co-Workers, p. 439. Independent fields of operation did not bar mutual assistance in a co-operative fashion, as Ellis himself admits in regard to their having "mutual colleagues".

²²On the uncertainty who these brothers were, see Héring, I Cor., pp. 184-85; Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., p. 392; Barrett, I Cor., pp. 5, 391.

²³See Schmithals, Office of Apostle, pp. 60-61; Allo, II Cor., p. 224.

²⁴As ἀδελφός, δοῦλος, σύνδουλος, συνεργοί, κοινωνός are Archippus, Aristarchus, Demas, Epaphras, Justus, Luke, Mark, Onesimus, Philemon, and Tychicus (see Col. 1:7; 4:7, 9-11; Phlm. 1, 17, 20, 24; cf. Ellis, Co-Workers, passim).

²⁵The use of the term may imply that Epaphras (1:7) and Tychicus (4:7) belong to another, but co-operating, team. This, however, seems to place both these workers in relation to their team

in the same category as Timothy in relation to Paul. Thus Tychicus and Epaphras, perhaps working with Apollos, may in relation to him have had a role like Timothy's in relation to Paul, i.e., fellow missionaries (apostles, in Paul's terms of reference). Yet inasmuch as no reference is made to Apollos, they themselves may be the missionaries in this area as Apollos is in the Ephesus area, and as Paul is in Achaia (cf. Col. 1:6-7; I Cor. 4:14-16). Other workers noted in Colossians are referred to as fellow workers, a term more commonly used by Paul for team workers (see Ellis, Co-Workers, pp. 438, 440-41).

²⁶Aristarchus is mentioned in Col. 4:10 and Phlm. 24. According to Acts 19:29, he was a Macedonian travelling with Paul. Paul himself makes no claim that he converted him or that he brought him to Asia.

²⁷But see Moule, Col., n. 1, pp. 18-19.

²⁸Cf. Ellis, Co-Workers, p. 445, n. 3. Paul nowhere claims the churches in Asia to be his as he does the churches in Macedonia (I Thess. 1:5-10; Phil. 1:5) and Achaia (I Cor. 4:15-16); rather, he pointedly says otherwise (Col. 1:7; 2:1). If the Asian workers saw in Paul not only an apostle but also a co-operative associate who considered his brothers his equals, it is not difficult to appreciate how quickly they would have turned to him for counsel with their problems. If, as Rengstorf and Schmithals infer (see supra, n. 19), Apollos was not an apostle, and indeed not responsible to any apostle (in the narrower Judaistic sense now evolving) for the work being done in Asia, and even though Paul himself respected the validity of their work and of their apostleship according to his (and their) definition, yet, now that Judaizers were creating a serious problem over authority, these free lance missionaries might perceive the practical value of associating with an apostle who could qualify according to such terms, and so might have chosen Paul in order to give their work that restrictively defined apostolic authority. Paul, also realizing the growing practical need for this, though still respecting Asia as their territory, might have gladly obliged. In this way, a "school" may have been informally established by this combination of workers from all co-operating areas, as later developments and writings seem to imply (see Conzelmann, Weisheit, passim, especially pp. 233-34).

²⁹Conzelmann's idea (Weisheit, pp. 233-34) of a "school of Paul" fits well into this economic-social situation which we have deduced from the primary and secondary sources belonging to the period in conjunction with conditions alluded to in Colossians. The Asian "pupils" are Asian centred, and so the letter to the Colossians could well be, in the necessary parts, related to their preaching, which, although in harmony with his views and gospel, Paul allows to be expressive of his "school's" (i.e., Asian team's) mind and individuality. Thus the letter in such parts might be the outgrowth of their mutual discussion of the problems involved (cf. Conzelmann, Weisheit, p. 234, n. 5, though there is no reason at all why this cannot be true in conjunction with Paul). Paul was undoubtedly highly respected by the "school" for his gospel, his humility, and his missionary procedures and views. For him to have composed this letter in any other way would have demonstrated an authoritarian

spirit of apostolic control and interference such as he himself firmly resisted. He was training missionaries to think, to serve, and to carry on in their respective areas. Indeed Lohse in deploying his arguments against Pauline authorship (Col., pp. 177-83) elicits as characteristics of the letter precisely those features of missionary activity, organization, and practice which we have argued were characteristic of Paul, and which are very different from those of the Pastorals. If anything, Paul's "school" has been so well counselled and "schooled" by Paul that they are more explicitly "Pauline" than Paul himself (cf. Lohse, Col., p. 179). If it comes from the Pauline School, it could as well do so in this period rather than years later. This would account for many problems associated with Colossians, such as, Paul's relationship to workers and churches, the counsel sought, the interest of churches in Paul and Paul's in the churches even though he himself refrains from visiting them or exercising any control over them. It would also explain Paul's use of "I" and "we", the "I" being more frequent here than in I-II Thessalonians, even though there is no direct polemic, primarily because he is not a member of their team, and yet he has this peculiar relationship with them. Thus to the churches he needs to be personal, and yet associates himself as "we" with these team members. The whole is, to be sure, as Lohse suggests, a community project. But that is exactly what Paul himself has been working for. If a "school" relationship (but in a corporate, intimate sense of a team) exists here, it could be taken as a victory for Paul's principle.

³⁰Contra Schmithals, Paul and James, pp. 70-72, and Nickle, Collection, p. 67, who use Acts. In ὥστε καὶ βαρναβᾶς συνωπλήχθη, Gal. 2:13, the καί denotes an element of surprise in Paul that Barnabas would have joined Peter in this act, knowing Barnabas as he did, and especially inasmuch as the two of them had journeyed together to Jerusalem just to settle this major question.

³¹See Dungan, Sayings, pp. 41-80, passim, especially pp. 51-54, 61-62, 67-68.

³²This would explain Acts' (16:1-10) hurrying Paul, Silas, and Timothy over the eastern mission fields where others may have been working; cf. Haenchen, Acts, pp. 483-91, who suggests that a more detailed account may have been shortened. But it seems more likely that it is as we have suggested. There was no account, for there was no work done by Paul until he reached virgin territory, i.e., Macedonia. Acts 13:1-15:3, rather than being the "creation" of Luke, may perhaps represent the report of Barnabas' activities (alluded to here in Colossians) which are simultaneous with Paul's. This may have been retouched by Luke in order to introduce Paul into Barnabas' field as the proper apostle to the Gentiles. See Dockx, Chronologie, pp. 261-75 (cf. Acts' insertion of 18:19b-21a in order to give "Paul the distinction of having been the first to preach the Gospel in Ephesus" [so Ogg, Life of Paul, pp. 127-28]). The complex and much debated study of Acts' sources and chronology is beyond the scope of this thesis, yet on the basis of the method of this study a tentative solution might be suggested. Perhaps Paul's first meeting in Jerusalem is contained in Acts 11:30, 12:25, including the insert about Peter. If so, Paul's acquaintance with Barnabas falls within the early three year period after Paul's conversion, a "silent"

period in Paul's account. Then from 13:1 to 14:28 belongs to Barnabas' mission. From 15:40 to the end belongs to Paul's mission. The meeting at Jerusalem in ch. 18 is Luke's memory of a meeting there at this stage in Paul's career, which Luke abridges because it duplicates his fuller account of that meeting already presented at the end of his account of Barnabas' mission, ch. 15 (cf. Knox, Fourteen Years, p. 344; for other views of these meetings, see Caird, Apostolic Age, pp. 202-209). If so, then the method of analysing evidence argued for and followed in this study has also resulted to this extent in the discovery of the method of the author of Acts in chronicling in blocks the missions of Barnabas and of Paul. Once this is understood his chronology, on the whole, is the same as that derived from a study of Paul's letters, and we find that the external evidence fits into its place not only as alluded to by Paul, but also as indicated by Acts. Thus by using the primary sources as the basis of reconstruction the pieces of the chronological puzzle may possibly be put together into a meaningful whole, and on this understanding the historical reliability of Acts is greatly enhanced.

³³Cf. Ellis, Co-Workers, pp. 439, 445, n. 3. It should be remembered that this is before the Jerusalem conference. Acts does preserve a memory that at this time Paul and Barnabas were in some way working together; in this study only the way in which Acts remembers and records it is questioned.

³⁴Who delivered the information about Mark to the Colossians (4:10), or how it was delivered to them is not said; but some such understanding must have existed between the co-operating teams and churches of the co-operating areas. Historically, as Dockx, Chronologie, p. 276, n. 1, suggests, there may not have been any dispute between Barnabas and Paul over Mark.

³⁵Paul seems to have preferred the use of the word "apostle" in its wider sense (i.e., an itinerant preacher of the gospel) in his earlier letters, I and II Thess., II Cor. 2:14-7:4 (cf. Schnackenburg, Apostles, pp. 301-303); and as has been suggested above, for the sake of his identity with his team, he would have preferred that sense in his later letters. Therefore, there could be here a partial glimpse of the evolution of the concept of apostleship within the time of Paul's own career. Though the narrower use of the term "apostle" in the Jerusalem church may have gone back to the teachings of Jesus himself (see Rengstorff, ἀπόστολος, p. 429), the chronology and sequence of letters that have been suggested in this study might suggest a more natural view of the development of its use, at least in the Pauline churches.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

¹The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, SBT, 2d Ser., No. 19 (London, 1971). The occasion of Paul's letter, he says, is "a very tangled and tense set of circumstances", viz., the need for Rome's support for his Spanish mission and for his journey to Jerusalem, and the difficulties reported within the various house-churches whose number (five) and nature are revealed in Rom. 14-16 (pp. 1-34, passim). The letter is

directed first to one then to another of these groups (often in rapid succession), the two extremes of which represented on the one side "the kind of Gentile constituency which Paul had alienated in collecting the fund", and on the other "the kind of Jewish constituency which would be angered by Paul's delivery of the fund" (p. 5), with the situation in chs. 14-15 being "the target of the whole epistle" (p. 33). Minear then isolates passages within the body of the "letter" as meant for specific groups in Rome, as for instance he says that 6:1 is an assertion made by the Gentile "strong" (p. 63), whom Paul answers. But according to the method of diatribe, 6:1 can just as well be a Jewish Christian scoffer's sarcastic retort to the arguments which close ch. 5 (cf. Dodd, Rom., p. 84); and also 7:1 does not necessarily mark a change of addressees. Then 7:1-8:17, especially 8:1-17, "sin in the flesh", he limits primarily to the Judaizers (group one), who condemn their Christian brothers (pp. 67-69); and the confident assurances of 8:18-39, he says are directed to the doubters (group three) (pp. 69-71). Thus his approach seems to be arbitrary in its assignment of particular group peculiarities to passages and vice versa, and unduly confident in supposing that one can gain such detailed knowledge of affairs in Rome merely from the key provided in chs. 14-16 (virtually, 14:1-15:13).

²Salvation of Mankind, pp. 197-200 (note his inclusion of Jerusalem, p. 66), following Manson, "St. Paul's Letter to the Romans--and Others" [first published in BJRL, XXXI (1948)], in idem, Studies, pp. 225-41 (note his ref. to Jerusalem, p. 240). Knox, Rom., p. 368, does not rule out the possibility that it might have been a general letter; cf. also idem, "A Note on the Text of Romans", NTS, II (1955-1956), 191-93.

³That this was the time and place where Paul wrote Romans, cf. commentaries by Barrett, pp. 3-4; Dodd, pp. xxiv-xxvi; Knox, p. 358; Sanday and Headlam, pp. xxxvi-xxxviii; Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, Meyer (10. Aufl.; Göttingen, 1955), pp. 1-2; M. J. Lagrange, Saint Paul: Epître aux Romains, EtB (Paris, 1916), p. xvii; Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary, trans. Harold Knight (London, 1961), pp. 9-10, 13-14; and Kümmel, Introduction, p. 215. But see Leenhardt, op. cit., nn., p. 9; Theophilus Mills Taylor, "The Place of Origin of Romans", JBL, LXVII (1948), 281-95; Wilhelm Michaelis, Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Bern, 1946), pp. 160-62.

⁴On Jerusalem as the centre of the church, cf. Hahn, Mission, p. 48; Georgi, Geschichte der Kollekten, pp. 24-30; Munck, Salvation of Mankind, p. 302; Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., p. 386, n.*. But as far as Paul is concerned, the statement that Jerusalem is the centre of the church can only be made with strict reservations if at all. It is true that Paul cannot let himself and his Gentile churches become "freebooters" (so Günther Bornkamm, "Der Römerbrief als Testament des Paulus", in idem, Glaube II, pp. 137-38), but that does not mean that unity lay in submission to Jerusalem. For such a view contradicts Paul's own affirmations of complete independence from temporal Jerusalem and from any human authority over him, over his gospel, or over the Gentile churches (cf. Leenhardt, Rom., pp. 13, 37, 370-77; cf. Bruce, Galatian Problems 3, pp. 261-62; Schlier, Gal., pp. 55-57). Nor is his and his companions' journey to Jeru-

saalem with the offering "undoubtedly a sign of the eschatological flow of the wealth of the nations to Mt. Zion" (so Gaston, No Stone, p. 432), for there is no suggestion in Paul's letters that this is a reason for the journey or for the offering. Such interpretations fail to see that Paul is breaking with the self-centred, Zion-centred particularism present even in the noblest of O. T. universalism, which is what much of Paul's polemics with Judaizers is about, and that he is insisting that Israel can no longer be "self" conscious but must be "world" conscious if it is to fulfil its mission to bring all mankind to the worship of the one universal God.

⁵Hermeneutik (Bad Cannstatt, 1954), p. 191, cited by Bornkamm, Römerbrief, p. 137, n. 46, and by Marxsen, Introduction, pp. 94-95, n. 31.

⁶Introduction, pp. 97-101.

⁷Paul, pp. 88-96; Römerbrief, pp. 120-39, especially pp. 135 ff. On this see M. Jack Suggs, "'The Word is Near You': Romans 10:6-10 Within the Purpose of the Letter", in Christian History, Farmer, pp. 289-312.

⁸"Der Brief nach Jerusalem: Über Veranlassung und Adresse des Römerbriefes", StTh, XXV (1971), 61-73. Our conclusion was arrived at before reading Jervell, whose thesis in any case stops short of the one we are presenting.

⁹Cf. Rom. 15:30-32 which may provide a clue to the situation for writing the body of Romans as well as for writing to the Romans (cf. Bornkamm, Römerbrief, p. 136). Paul was afraid of the Jews, i.e., τῶν ἑπαιθεύων; but were hardened Judaizers also in this category? (Cf. II Cor. 11:13-15; Phil. 3:2; etc.) Were the leaders in Jerusalem also afraid? (Cf. Gal. 2:12.) See further on Jewish nationalism and the pressure on Jewish Christians, Bo Reicke, The New Testament Era: The World of the Bible from 500 B.C. to A.D. 100, trans. David E. Green (London, 1969), pp. 202-203, and William Reuben Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period (New York, 1956), passim, especially pp. 65-68, 125-58. The leaders had accepted Paul and had agreed to the offering just a short time before; so it seems unlikely that this could possibly be the objective all over again. Was Paul, therefore, trying to make it easy for them to receive (the basic meaning of εὐπροσδεκτος) the offering by trying to convert the Judaizers and by giving a solution to the ethical problems involved, and so to strengthen the will of these leaders? The suggestions of Suggs, op. cit., pp. 289-312, are the nearest to the position taken here, except that he limits his discussion to Rom. 10:6-10. He sees it, however, clearly as preparation for Jerusalem.

¹⁰For a discussion of these questions see especially Manson, Studies, ch. 12 [Romans], taken up by Munck, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 196-200; Knox, Rom., pp. 363-68, also, Text of Romans, pp. 191-93; Sanday and Headlam, Rom., pp. lxxxv-xcvi; Dodd, Rom., pp. xiii-xxiv; Kirsopp Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul: Their Motive and Origin (London, 1911), pp. 324-70, 414-20; Barrett, Rom., pp. 9-13; Leenhardt, Rom., pp. 25-29. See also Bornkamm, Römerbrief, n. 25, pp. 127-28; Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 222-26.

¹¹See Étienne Trocmé, "L'Épître aux Romains et la Méthode Missionnaire de L'Apôtre Paul", NTS, VII (1960-1961), 150-53. Cf. Dodd, Rom., p. xxxi; Lagrange, Rom., pp. xxxi-xxxiv; Sanday and Headlam, Rom., pp. xxxix-xliv; Robson, Composition, pp. 289-99; Deissmann, Paul, pp. 23-24; Marxsen, Introduction, pp. 92-93. See also J. N. Sevenster, Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known?, Supplements to NovTest, XIX (Leiden, 1968), 12.

¹²The reference in II Cor. 10:10, as noted by Plummer, II Cor., pp. 282-83, does not seem to refer to his personal appearance, but to his inability in face to face situations to express his thoughts clearly in oral form (see also Barrett, II Cor., pp. 260-61). It is doubtful, however, if that handicap was due, as Plummer suggests, to a habit of trying to please everyone, which seems to be a misinterpretation of I Cor. 9:20; it may have been due to some difficulty experienced in extemporaneous preaching of the word. The power of words seemed to fail him in these circumstances, cf. I Cor. 1:17, where he tacitly admits his inability compared with skilled orators. So he relied upon the power of the Spirit to fill him with a zeal that would carry him through, cf. I Cor. 2:1-5. I Cor. 2:3 especially bears out this self-analysis and gives the reason--"fear and trembling", or as translated by Robertson and Plummer, I Cor., p. 29, see also pp. 31-32, "in weakness and timidity and painful nervousness".

¹³Cf. Robson, Composition, p. 291; Manson, Studies, p. 240.

¹⁴On the extent of the knowledge of Greek in Palestine, see Sevenster, Greek, passim, especially pp. 176-91.

¹⁵For γράφειν: Rom. 15:15; 16:22; I Cor. 4:14; 5:9, 11; 7:1; 9:15; 14:37; II Cor. 1:13; 2:3, 4, 9; 7:12; 9:1; 13:10; Gal. 1:20; 6:11; Phil. 3:1; I Thess. 4:9; 5:1; II Thess. 3:17; Phlm. 19, 21.

For ἐπιστολή: Rom. 16:22; I Cor. 5:9; II Cor. 1:13; 7:8 (twice); 10:9, 10, 11; Col. 4:12; I Thess. 5:27; II Thess. 2:2, 15; 3:14, 17.

For ἀναγινώσκειν: II Cor. 1:13; Col. 4:16 (three times); I Thess. 5:27.

Paul uses γράφειν in Rom. 15:15, but this is in his acknowledged letter to the Romans and in the verse that explains why he sends the argumentation to them. The other references to γράφειν or ἐπιστολή are in 16:22, also part of an acknowledged letter whether to Rome or to Ephesus.

¹⁶Barrett, Rom., p. 43. On the diatribe, see also Bornkamm, Römerbrief, p. 125, and Rudolf Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 13. Heft (Göttingen, 1910).

¹⁷On 1:16-17 see Barrett's paper, I am Not Ashamed. His thesis would be more plausible if the Sitz im Leben is taken which is being proposed in this chapter (cf. the questions raised by Evans, pp. 46-47, in the discussion following Barrett's paper). Paul is preparing for a trial situation, but not for one instituted

by the Jerusalem church, far less by the Roman church, but by God at this decisive moment when the whole church will be summoned before him at this coming confrontation of Paul with the Palestinian church centred in Jerusalem. Hence Paul's request for the prayers of the Roman church. To those gathered in Jerusalem Paul will indeed present the significance of the total event of Jesus Christ (cf. Barrett, pp. 30-31); but he knows that he will be judged according to the commission that was laid upon him not by Jerusalem but by God himself. He is not ashamed of this gospel which he is now going to set before them in the following address. In this address he does not openly insult or rebuke his audience (cf. this tact with his polemics in I-II Cor. and Gal.), but declares to them the gospel that he preaches and that he expects them likewise to proclaim, because it is God's gospel.

If Paul should be preparing a manuscript for oral address to the church in Jerusalem, it is of interest to see how he uses an approach aimed at winning his audience by, e.g., treating Gentile failure (1:18-32) before he treats the failure of his own people (2:1 ff.; cf. Amos' approach to the doom of his people, Amos 1:1-3:2). Also, if the Roman church was primarily a Gentile church, then Paul's argumentation, which begins and is sustained on a pro-Jewish note, would seem somewhat doubtful as a method of winning Gentile support, when, as far as his other letters are concerned, this was played down (cf. this as another reason for his apologies in 15:14-15).

¹⁸Cf., e.g., II Cor. 3:7-15; the spirit of 11:12-12:1; Gal. 4:21-31; 5:2-6, 11-12; Phil. 3:7-11; also Acts 21:21, 27-36. Cf. Oostendorp, Another Jesus, p. 55.

¹⁹Hahn, Mission, pp. 39-41, 50-54, 58.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 56-57; see also Jeremias, Jesus' Promise, pp. 55-73; Nickle, Collection, pp. 113-14.

²¹Cf. Leenhardt, Rom., pp. 60-61, 95; Barrett, Rom., pp. 71, 119; Thornton, Common Life, p. 39. The contrast between Paul's argument in Gal. 3 and Rom. 4 (see Boers, Ghetto, pp. 95-103) is explicable when the audiences are taken into consideration. Paul is not changing his concept, but only his perspective. If Paul were still speaking to a Gentile church audience (e.g., Rome), he would surely have spoken as he did in Gal. 3; but hardly so when speaking directly to the Jewish Christians at the seat of Judaism. So Paul is not rejecting or changing his concept in Gal. 3, and so also he does not perceive that he "showed a way for a theology out of the Ghetto" at this point (as Boers, pp. 100-103, would have it; see Conzelmann, Weisheit, p. 232), because he is speaking within the context of the Elect and to those who are in that context, i.e., to those who are the Israel of God (cf. Gal. 6:16, see Richardson, Israel, pp. 82-84). See A. N. Wilder, "The Church and Israel in the Light of Election", StEv, IV, 347-57; George Howard, "Romans 3:21-31 and the Inclusion of the Gentiles", HTR, LXIII (1970), 230-33; Bring, Paul and the O.T., pp. 44-48; Jervell, Brief nach Jerusalem, pp. 68-69; Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 84; J. A. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Ser., XX (Cambridge, England, 1972), pp. 164-95, 208-209.

²²See Evans, Resurrection, pp. 166-68.

²³See Barrett, From First Adam, pp. 1-21; idem, Rom., p. 111; Robin Scroggs, The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology (Oxford, 1966), pp. 78-79, 89-91; Gibbs, Creation, pp. 48-58; Dodd, Rom., pp. 78-82; Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, p. 32.

²⁴See Barrett, From First Adam, pp. 92-94; also Knox, Rom., pp. 462-69. Possibly the confusion in the analogy with Adam in vv. 12-17, where the parallelism is not strictly carried out in that the sin of one man is not balanced by the righteousness of another (though it finally becomes clear in vv. 18-21) is due to Paul's conviction that whatever is done through Christ is done by God himself. It is God's free gift. The lack of balance is therefore in the material contrast between Adam's sin and God's free gift; cf. Gibbs, Creation, pp. 49-50; also Sanday and Headlam, Rom., p. 133; Barrett, Rom., pp. 112-19.

²⁵See Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 78, continuation of n. 27; Gibbs, Creation, pp. 48-51; and Dodd, Rom., pp. 78-83, who (p. 186) perceives that Paul finally envisions at the great consummation no stopping "until at last there will be life from the dead for the entire race" (11:30-32). Contra Ziesler, Righteousness in Paul, p. 198, n. 2, it would seem that Paul is making a transition to this thought here in ch. 5, and finally clearly states it in 5:19; see Karl Barth, Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5, trans. T. A. Smail, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 5 (Edinburgh, 1956), pp. 42-45. Sanday and Headlam, Rom., p. 140, make a qualification of potentiality based on an "if", "if they embrace the redemption that is offered to them".

²⁶Leenhardt, Rom., pp. 146-47. In this passage Paul seems to be mixing the "now" and the "not yet", the limited universalism and the apocalyptic universalism. The ultimate ecumenism breaks out more fully in vv. 18-21. Cf. Gibbs, Creation, pp. 52-57, especially p. 57. See also Best, One Body, pp. 37-38, who notes that "there is a potential solidarity of all men with Christ and a real solidarity of all believers with him."

²⁷Cf. Barrett, Rom., pp. 113-19; idem, From First Adam, pp. 69-76, 82-89; Davies, Rabbinic Judaism, p. 49; Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 112; Moule, Phenomenon, p. 14, "ultimate man"; Karl Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns from 6th ed., with a new preface by the author (London, 1933), pp. 164-87; Scroggs, Last Adam, p. 96.

²⁸See C. F. D. Moule, "Death 'to Sin', 'to Law', and 'to the World': A Note on Certain Datives", in Mélanges Bibliques: Igliaux, p. 372.

²⁹See Brink, Paul and the O.T., pp. 32-33; cf. p. 47, where he says that Christ is the completion of the law; also Ulrich Wilckens, "Was heisst bei Paulus: 'Aus Werken des Gesetzes wird kein Mensch gerecht'?", Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Heft 1 (Zürich, 1969), p. 70; Werner Georg Kümmel, Man in the New Testament, trans. John J. Vincent (rev. ed.; London, 1963), pp. 38-71, especially pp. 49 ff. Also see Ernst Fuchs, Studies of

the Historical Jesus, SBT, No. 42 (London, 1964), pp. 69-72; C. F. D. Moule, "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul", in Christian History, Farmer, pp. 401-404.

³⁰Cf. Cerfaux, Christ, pp. 419-24; also Stanley, Soteriology, pp. 191-95, who sees the irrational, material world sharing man's destiny; G. B. Caird, Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology (Oxford, 1956), pp. 27-30, 76-77; M. E. Dahl, The Resurrection of the Body, SBT, No. 36 (London, 1962), ch. 5, and pp. 109-10, 113-16. Some would limit "the whole creation" to the non-human, others to humanity, as, e.g., Walter Gutbrod, Die Paulinische Anthropologie, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, Vierte Folge, Heft 15 (Stuttgart, 1934), pp. 12-18; Oostendorp, Another Jesus, pp. 87-88.

³¹Cf. Knox, Rom., pp. 524-34; Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, trans. Carl C. Rasmussen (London, 1952), p. 347; Minear, Obedience, p. 70 (even more applicable to Jerusalem). On the relation of God's elect people to the rest of creation, see Gibbs, Creation, pp. 40-41; Eduard Schweizer, "The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ", in idem, Neotestamentica, p. 320; Amos N. Wilder, "Eschatological imagery and Earthly Circumstance", NTS, V (1958-1959), 232, 243-44. See also Gager, End-Time Language, pp. 329-30.

³²So Dodd, Rom., pp. 146-47; see Nygren, Rom., pp. 353-60 for a summary of such views (which he himself does not hold).

³³Rom., pp. 148-50.

³⁴Rom., pp. 355-59, especially pp. 357-58.

³⁵Brief nach Jerusalem, p. 71. The problem of chs. 9-11, when understood as written to Rome, is recognized by Bent Noack, "Current and Backwater in the Epistle to the Romans", StTh, XIX (1965), 155.

³⁶For a more detailed examination of 10:6-10, see Suggs, Word is Near You, pp. 289-312.

³⁷See Richardson, Israel, pp. 129-30; Wilder, Church and Israel, p. 345; Schlier, Relevance, p. 206.

³⁸Rom., p. 11; so, too, Jervell, op. cit., p. 68, yet on p. 70 he says that this main theme about God's righteousness is constantly interrupted. See Ernest Best, The Letter of Paul to the Romans: Commentary, The Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge, England, 1967), pp. 7-8.

³⁹Cf. Wilder, Church and Israel, p. 350; Schweizer, Body of Christ, p. 320; Oostendorp, Another Jesus, pp. 54-55. Israel has no special privilege, but a special mission, as does the church. Thus Paul corrects his Jewish opponents by showing them where their priority lies, i.e., purely in their mission to the world, not in any status apart from the world. Cf. Rowley, Election, pp. 120-21.

⁴⁰See Nygren, Rom., pp. 404-405; cf. Barrett, Rom., pp. 223-24. So, too, Gerhardsson, Memory, pp. 274-75, but not, as he

implies (ch. 15), by underlining Jerusalem's centrality in the church, but rather by acknowledging that because they are elected to be the vehicle of these cosmic events for the world their duty is all the more outward to the world in obedience to the real source and centre which is in heaven. If the first conference had limited the geographic or ethnic spheres of mission, then Paul is here revoking that schismatic agreement, and on the basis of his gospel is endeavouring to bring about unity of effort in the missionary programme of a united church. This is his point in Romans, the thrust of his argument: the receivers of the law, of the promises, and now of their fulfilment in Christ and the gospel, cannot become an introverted self-congratulatory group as though election meant divine recognition of ethnic distinction, emulating worldly systems of mutual admiration in self-righteous preening and social stratification (note how Paul recognizes these successively in 9-11, and successively knocks each down until he arrives at his desired universalism in 11:31-32), and so frustrate God's purpose in the cosmic events (cf. 9:6, 30-31; 10:21; 11:1, 3, 11, 28). But of course God is ultimately the victor, 11:26, 32-36.

⁴¹See Richardson, Israel, pp. 126-28; Wilder, Church and Israel, p. 350; Nygren, Rom., p. 408; Dodd, Rom., pp. 182-88; and Minear, Obedience, p. 97. On the problem of the "all" which causes many exegetes to hesitate to take it of every individual (so hardly ecumenically universal, although ecumenically representative), see e.g., Barrett, Rom., p. 227; Sanday and Headlam, Rom., pp. 332-40, 347-50. The existence of God's wrath in history and in eschatology is acknowledged by Paul, but its redemptive purpose, except in respect of the wrath visited upon the Jews, cf. I Thess. 2:16b. Rom. 9-11, is not worked out by Paul in respect of the unbelievers. Héring, I Cor., pp. 162-69, especially pp. 165-67, and deux résurrections, passim, discusses this problem in respect of the "all" in 15:22 and of the non-resurrection of non-believers. According to his interpretation, the "all" in Adam is universal, but in Christ it is limited to the few who are to be found in him--and so throughout I Cor. 15. It is true that Paul does not discuss the fate of non-believers in I Cor. 15, but that is not his concern in this chapter. The verses, however, which Héring limits to those in Christ (especially v. 22) can also indicate that Paul assumes that the problem has a victorious resolution in Christ's warfare described in vv. 24-28 (cf. Rom. 8:19-21), i.e., it takes place in what Héring calls "the end" (p. 166). In Romans, however, Paul seems to be struggling with this problem of universalism of salvation against the obvious background of the existence of God's wrath upon all sinners. But of one thing Paul seems certain: in Christ God is ultimately and universally victorious. Universalism is the unborn word understood in chs. 5 and 8. Therefore, to force a new particularism into these passages or into chs. 9-11 is to make faith another "work" enabling man to limit God's freedom to determine the ultimate goal for his creation, which Paul will not permit. He concludes his argumentation with a total reliance upon God to secure the universal ultimate; cf. Noack, Current, pp. 165-66. Cf. Stanley, Soteriology, pp. 48, 139-42, 178 ff., 191-95, 279--though he seems to avoid the universality of 11:32. Although for Paul the secrets of the ultimate remain hidden in the omnipotence and omniscience of God, nevertheless, because of the Christ-event, the hope for ultimate universality of the "all" runs throughout Paul's argu-

ment in Romans, and finds its climax in Rom. 11:32. See Knox, Rom., pp. 576-78; Caird, Principalities, pp. 39-40, 96.

⁴²So Lagrange, Rom., p. 291; Knox, Rom., pp. 371-72, 578-80; Sanday and Headlam, Rom., p. 351. Barrett, Rom., p. 230, and Brunner, Rom., p. 101, recognize the interconnection of the two major sections. But the unity and purpose of the composition is lost sight of by Minear, Obedience, p. 82.

⁴³Paul's fear for his own life may be a reason for this call for more Jewish Christians to follow him to the Gentiles, and for his probable general distribution of the letter. See Schweizer, Body of Christ, p. 329; Thornton, Common Life, pp. 19-21.

⁴⁴Jervell, Brief nach Jerusalem, pp. 65-66, notes that in ancient letters and in Paul's letters the true purpose and concern of the letter writer was expressed in sentences most of which were introduced with a phrase such as, "I request (beseech)", "I implore", "I entreat", and that there are three such sentences: 12:1; 15:30; 16:17 in Romans. The last he rejects; but of course if ch. 16 was not originally part of Romans, it would automatically be removed from consideration. Then because he fails to see 1:16-15:13 as originally a separate composition, he regards the first as merely an introduction to the ethical section of the letter to the Romans. Therefore, he has to regard the second as the reason for "Romans"--which, for the copy that was finally sent to Rome, it of course is. But the first is the natural explanation for the address to Jerusalem, and vice versa, 1:16-15:13 as originally a separate composition distinct from the rest of Romans would explain the presence of this phrase here.

⁴⁵Cf. Schweizer, Body of Christ, p. 329. So his request for their prayers. What God's will might be for him personally, he leaves in God's hands (15:32). But prayer is efficacious in effecting God's will in existing circumstances, the $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha$ of v. 32 being the result of action requested in vv. 30-31; cf. Michel, Röm., p. 3, including n. 3.

⁴⁶Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, "ΜΕΤΡΟΝ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in Romans XII.3", NTS, VIII (1961-1962), 345-51; also Thornton, Common Life, p. 40; Best, One Body, pp. 105-106; and Enslin, Paul, p. 138. Contra Gnllka, Geistliches Amt, p. 237, who intimates that Paul is not discussing a concrete situation regarding unity. For Rome, hardly; but if this is his address to Jerusalem, definitely so.

⁴⁷As Barrett, Rom., p. 240, observes, it is not the need of the saints of the Jerusalem church that is referred to in 12:13, but the general application of Christian charity. Of course Paul could also have in mind the reciprocal attitudes of love and community on the part of both the receiver of shared blessings and the giver. In that case, if this is for ears in Jerusalem, he could be subtly intimating that not only the contribution "to the needs of the saints" but also the right reception of the offering and of those who brought it are equally acts of Christian love, thus the following phrase, "practise hospitality".

⁴⁸Marcus Borg's study, "A New Context for Romans XIII", NTS,

XIX (1972-1973), 205-18, would be more valid if Rom. 13 was written, as we have argued, not to Rome but to Jerusalem, for most of his arguments are descriptive of Zealot nationalism rampant in Palestine at this time (cf. his own illustrations, passim, e.g., pp. 209, 210, n. 9; 211; Josephus, B.J., passim, and Paul's own direct and indirect experiences with this intense Jewish nationalism as discussed in the chapters above). The anti-semitic treatment of the Jews in Rome by Tiberius, Gaius, and the last in 41 (not 49) by Claudius might give cause for Romans 13, but those disturbances were at least ten and more years before Paul wrote Romans and none were caused by open hostility to Roman authority and its right to tax within its own capital, such as, however, was constantly the trouble in Palestine, plagued by Zealot nationalism which even threatened the existence of the Jerusalem church. Borg's "new context" makes much of Rome's "sword-bearing role" (pp. 216-17); but that role is far more applicable to its use in the province of Judaea than in Rome, as Jerusalem was only too soon to experience. Thus the essay is a stronger and more valid defence of the position that we are taking, i.e., Romans 13 (1:16-15:13) was written to Jerusalem, than of the one that it was written to Rome.

⁴⁹Inasmuch as crowds from the Diaspora attended the festivals in Jerusalem every year (cf. Ramsay, Roads, p. 399; Jeremias, Jerusalem, p. 58), Paul must have been aware that some of his enemies would be going as pilgrims to the Holy City. According to Acts 21:27-28, Jews from Asia spotted Paul in Jerusalem and staged a riot. The reference in Acts 20:3 is to an immediate threat to his life, possibly on the high seas (cf. R. J. Knowling, "The Acts of the Apostles", EGT, II, p. 421; C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, BNTC [2d ed.; London, 1964], p. 229; commentaries by Foakes-Jackson, Macgregor, and Haenchen, ad loc.; Bornkamm, Römerbrief, p. 136). But Paul was aware of the general danger long before this.

⁵⁰According to the suggestion offered here, there is no need to see any contradiction in Paul's two statements to the Romans, 1) that he considered Rome an intermediary station on his way to Spain (cf. 1:11-15; 15:24, 28, 32), 2) that he made it his principle not to missionize another's territory. Therefore, no supposition of an interpolation is necessary to resolve it (see Günter Klein, "Der Abfassungszweck des Römerbriefes", in idem, Rekonstruktion und Interpretation: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament, Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, Band 50 [München, 1969], pp. 130-32), nor resource to opportunism by making his principle a "rule" instead of a "law" when it is to his advantage, as though Paul were interested in crowning his life's work in Rome (so Michel, Röm., pp. 2-3, 325); nor a retreat from his concept of "open apostleship" by arrogantly assuming, what before he declared to be God's prerogative, that Rome could only be officially part of the church by his apostolic confirmation (so Klein, op. cit., pp. 138 ff.; see refutation by Bornkamm, Römerbrief, p. 139, n. 47); nor can the contradiction be resolved by saying that Paul becomes their official "defender" in Jerusalem, since he, the apostle to the Gentiles, includes them in what presumably is here his priestly service as official officer of the Gentiles to God (so Bornkamm, op. cit., pp. 137-39, including n. 47); nor is Paul ranking the Roman church above the other Gentiles, because it is located in the imperial city (so also Bornkamm, loc.

cit.). Nothing in Paul's letters gives Rome that kind of status. Romans as a letter sent to the Roman church would have the same intent as that of his journey to Jerusalem and indeed of his whole missionary enterprise, i.e., to call for mutual co-operation in an ecumenically united church built upon the only possible foundation, namely, Christ as presented in what Paul was convinced was the true gospel.

⁵¹So Sanday and Headlam, Rom., pp. 404-405; Dodd, Rom., pp. 226-27; Leenhardt, Rom., p. 367; Knox, Rom., pp. 644-45; Barrott, Rom., p. 275; Bornkamm, Römerbrief, pp. 137-39; Schweizer, Body of Christ, p. 320.

⁵²Rom., ad loc.

⁵³Rom., pp. 350-51.

⁵⁴Rom., pp. 367-69; cf. Dodd, Rom., pp. 226-27.

⁵⁵For making Rome such a sponsor, see Dodd, Rom., pp. 228-29; Minear, Obedience, pp. 2-3, 23-24. For uses in the N. T. of "to be sped on my journey there by you" (15:24), cf. Acts 15:3; I Cor. 16:6, 11; II Cor. 1:16; Titus 3:13; III John 6. As Sanday and Headlam, Rom., p. 411, state, Rom. 15:24 need be no more than an expressed desire for their "prayers and good wishes".

⁵⁶Cf. Leenhardt, Rom., p. 373; Knox, Rom., pp. 359-60. It is possible that Paul was planning to finance his mission to Spain in the same way as he had financed those in the East. If it is possible that there he had worked for Prisca and Aquila, then it may be conjectured that he was planning to continue that business relationship with them in the West. and through their contacts in Rome with trade guilds and the church, that he was even expecting workers comparable to Timothy and Titus to be provided to go with him. On the economic background of this possibility, see Oertel, Economic Unification, p. 409; R. J. Forbes, Studies in Ancient Technology (Vol. IV, 2d rev. ed., Vol. V, 2d ed.; Leiden, 1964-1966), IV, 236-39; V, 53-57.

⁵⁷It is in this connection that πεντηρωκένοι (Rom. 15:19) should be particularly noted. The basic meaning is "I made full or complete" [or, "gave it its full expression", cf. Paul's use of this term in Gal. 5:14] and not "I have fully preached" (see Arndt-Gingrich, pp. 676-77). Paul's organization of teams, counselling and teaching apostles in neighbouring fields, going twice to Jerusalem to present his gospel, perhaps even distributing several copies of Rom. 1:16-15:13 to leading area churches, would do this efficiently and thoroughly.

⁵⁸Rom. 15:14-33, pp. 10-11.

⁵⁹For a survey of the main points in the discussion see Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 229-35, who favours either a Caesarean or Roman imprisonment.

⁶⁰On the basis of information supplied by Acts. that leaves only Caesarea or Rome as places of the possible origin of the letter.

The contents seem to indicate a Caesarean origin.

For Philippians as a compilation of several letters, see Beare, Phil., pp. 24-29, Fitzmyer, Resurrection, p. 412, Schmithals, Philippianerbriefe, pp. 48-58, Koester, Philippians III; as a unity, Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 235-37, Moehring, Phil. 3:3ff., pp. 432-36, Victor Furnish, "The Place and Purpose of Philippians III", NTS, X (1963-1964), 80-88. Beare and Kümmel give a résumé of the discussion. There is, of course, no reason why Paul could not have sent a message about Judaizers to Philippi after the Jerusalem meeting from near the centre of their militant movement, i.e., Palestine. A decision cannot be made simply on the question of Judaizing, but must take in style and the relation of the contents to historical circumstances. The inclusion of "us" (and probably "brethren") in 3:17 could provide evidence that 3:2-4:1 is part of an earlier letter, bringing it nearer to the "I" and "we" references noted in the Corinthian letters when trouble was its severest for Paul from both Jews and Judaizers. Cf., e.g., Phil. 3:4-11 and II Cor. 11:21-12:10; Phil. 3:12-16 and I Cor. 13:9-14:1; Phil. 3:17 and I Cor. 4:15-16; Phil. 3:18-4:1 and II Cor. 11:12-15. But because it occurs only once, it could also be an intentional identification of Paul with Timothy in the continuing relationship which he may be planning for him to have with the Macedonian church. Paul's change of mood in this passage could reflect merely a natural change of temper when he turns to the subject of Palestinian Judaizers or Zealots and attempts to warn the Philippians to be on the watch for them since he knows from recent experience how determined and militant a group they are.

There are strong arguments for the Roman origin of Philippians. The evidence, however, is not as final as many, e.g., lately Bo Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome and the Captivity Epistles", in Apostolic History, Gasque, pp. 277-86, would seem to have it, for (1) according to our chronology Caesarea cannot be ruled out for Philippians. (2) It is true that "ἐν" with the dative [as in the phrase, ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ (1:13)] may have the meaning, "to" (cf. Arndt-Gingrich, p. 260); but in such cases "ἐν" still has the nuance of "within", "in", "among". Also, since in 1:13 "ἐν" is not repeated before the dative, λαοῖς, "ἐν" could refer to πραιτωρίῳ alone, in which case Paul could intend the usual meaning, "in", i.e., "in all the palace", referring naturally not to the building but to the people associated with it. It therefore could be a reference to the praetorium of Herod in Caesarea (cf. Acts 23:35b, and note the same construction ἐν τῷ πραιτωρίῳ). With the translation, "in the whole palace", Paul includes those in the many forms of imperial service, thus corresponding with "Caesar's household", which he uses in the greetings (4:22). On "Caesar's household", cf. Beare, Phil., p. 22, Moulton-Milligan, p. 315, J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations (8th ed.; London, 1885), p. 171. (3) Reicke concludes with this statement (p. 286), "Paul is happy to be able to extend greetings from clients of the imperial house to the readers in Philippi. This fine point is lost if one does not accept Rome as the place where Paul had such success in important circles (Phil. 1:12)". But this interpretation is not in accord with Paul's character. Paul's wording is not as pompous as this implies, and Paul was hardly such a status seeker. References in 4:22 are more likely to people known to others in Philippi, converts from among the lesser servants and guards, who would be the ones coming in contact with

Paul. (4) Nowhere in Paul's letters or in Acts is Timothy mentioned as being in Rome, or even as a passenger on the ship to Rome, nor for that matter is Epaphroditus, which had the compiler of Acts had that information it seems unlikely he would have missed the opportunity to include it in his account. It is noteworthy in this respect that he does include Aristarchus, not as a prisoner, but as one accompanying Paul, whether for the whole or part of the journey is not said. No mention is made of him again. If the "we" in the change of person from ch. 27 f. should include either Timothy or Epaphroditus, surely, again, the author of Acts would have mentioned it.

⁶¹Introduction, p. 231.

⁶²So J. Hugh Michael, The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians, MNTC (London, 1928), pp. 209-12.

⁶³The readiness of the Philippian church to participate in Paul's sufferings, not the Jerusalem church's avoidance of him, explains the unrequested gifts. To read into the text negligence on the part of the Jerusalem church (if Paul was in Caesarea, so Beare, Phil., pp. 17-18) is unwarranted. Of course, if Paul before his imprisonment had no need, neither would the Philippians have had an opportunity; but the response by the church was because of his trouble (cf. Phil. 4:14). Therefore, Epaphroditus must have been sent immediately after word arrived, which could have been relatively soon after Paul's arrest, if the delegates had quickly returned home when that trouble first broke out for Paul in Jerusalem. Of course, promptness in letting the Philippians know about Paul's trouble would hardly have been the case if the imprisonment was in Rome.

⁶⁴The journey to Philippi if by sea around the Achaian peninsula may take longer from Rome than from Caesarea. Cf. Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 230-32, 234; Ramsay, Roads, passim.

⁶⁵See Beare, Phil., p. 21, who states that nothing in style or language prevents it from being "the latest of them all". Cf. also Knox, Rom. 15:14-33, pp. 7-8.

⁶⁶A few difficulties may be cleared up if the passage, 2:19-24, is so interpreted. Paul wants to hear good news about the Philippians, but he does not say how or when. Verse 20 intimates a deeper motive behind the mission than just message bearing, which any of the travellers could perform. But Timothy's word will be of a different nature (cf. Ernest F. Scott, "The Epistle to the Philippians: Introduction and Exegesis", IB, XI [1955], pp. 67-68), because Timothy will carry on Paul's work there. This should possibly be connected with the troubles which Paul will warn them about in 3:2-4:1, but especially with the disunity affecting the church referred to in 4:2-7. This ecumenical work, so important to Paul, Timothy shares. News about the advancement of such work would be the kind of good news that Paul would want to hear, and it would be in the way that he would really prefer to hear about it (cf. I Thess. 1:7-9). This would be the inference to be gathered from 2:20, ὅτις γνησίως τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν μεριμνήσει, i.e., Timothy will genuinely care for them in these important matters, with a pastoral responsibility that takes time. Paul is sending him to be,

it seems, missionary-in-charge. Word will come to Paul either by others, or later by Timothy himself, or it will even wait until Paul himself arrives shortly afterwards (2:24). In addition, vv. 20-21 indicate that no other workers comparable to Timothy are around him, a condition, as we have seen, that seemingly was not the case in Ephesus.

⁶⁷Cf. Paul's own words about himself in 4:13, also in 1:20-26, hardly those of a man who felt that he was no longer at the height of his powers (as suggested by Beare, Phil., p. 19).

⁶⁸La vision de Paul, pp. 328-31.

⁶⁹See A. N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (reprinted from corrected sheets of 1st ed.; Oxford, 1969), pp. 57-65. Even his status as a Roman citizen is supplied only by Acts, but see Sherwin-White, pp. 144-56.

⁷⁰As may have been the case with Stephen; cf. D. R. Catchpole, "The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial", in Trial of Jesus, Bammel, p. 63.

⁷¹Cf. Dodd, Death of Jesus, p. 92, n. 2. See also K. Lake, "The End of Paul's Trial in Rome", Theologisch Tijdschrift, XLVII (Leiden, 1913), 356-65; cf. F. F. Bruce, "St. Paul in Rome", BJRL, XLVI (1963-1964), 343-45; and Sherwin-White, Roman Society, pp. 118-19.

⁷² $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ here may mean "with one will" or "with one desire" (cf. Arndt-Gingrich, p. 901). The soul is the centre of the inner life, or in Hebrew thought, the unity of the person, and so here would mean the unity of the church at its very centre, the oneness of will or motivation of the community, cf. Stacey, Pauline View, pp. 122-23, and Beare, Phil., pp. 66-67. In this connection the occurrence of "with bishops and deacons" (1:1) is striking, especially when this letter reflects Paul's concept of a statusless, socially ecumenical church for which he argued so intensely. On this see especially E. Best, "Bishops and Deacons: Philippians 1,1", StEv, IV, 371-76; Bo Reicke, "Unité Chrétienne et Diaconie: Phil. 1,1-11", Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht, Supplements to NovTest, VI (Leiden, 1962), pp. 203-12; cf. C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5-11", in Apostolic History, Gasque, pp. 264-76.

⁷³I.e., 2:5-11; cf. Martin, Carmen Christi, pp. 42-62, 287-306, see also pp. 84-88 on its ethical use by Paul; cf. also Reicke, Unité, and Moule, Further Reflexions, passim.

⁷⁴See the suggested interpretation of $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \xi\pi\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\varsigma$ (Phil. 4:16) by Rigaux, Thess., p. 461, and Best, Thess., p. 126.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

¹See supra, pp. 15, 184.

²See supra, p. 18, including n. 12 (p. 244); also p. 187, including n. 20 (p. 297).

³Cf. Rom. 11:11, 25-26. See Whiteley, Theology, pp. 95-98; Bornkamm, Paul, pp. 94-96; also cf. Munck, Salvation of Mankind, pp. 44-49.

⁴Cf. Rom. 1:18-3:23. See supra, pp. 184-91.

⁵For Paul the universality of sin--amongst both Gentiles and Jews--clearly demonstrates the solidarity of man before God; cf. Rom. 1:18-3:23; 5:12; 11:32a. See Minear, Obedience, pp. 96-97.

⁶Cf. Rom. 3-4; see supra, pp. 80-85, 187-88.

⁷See supra, pp. 20, 191-92. Cf. Gibbs, Creation, pp. 140-45.

⁸See Evans, Resurrection, pp. 89, 138; also Best, One Body, pp. 123-26; Minear, Images, pp. 210-11.

⁹See supra, pp. 83-85, including n. 31 (pp. 268-69), also pp. 88-89.

¹⁰Through this faith they receive the baptism of the Spirit; they are baptized into Christ, or are then "in Christ", the sign and seal of which is water baptism. On this see Best, One Body, ch. 3, "With Christ"; ch. 4, "Into Christ", passim, especially p. 73. See also Bultmann, Theology, I, 311-13.

¹¹Cf. Schweizer, Body of Christ, pp. 318-20, 327; Minear, Obedience, Appendix 1, pp. 91-101, especially pp. 95-98. See also Barth, Rom., p. 100 (noted also by Minear, op. cit., p. 96).

¹²See Best, One Body, pp. 1-30 (note especially pp. 20-21), 78-80; and L. Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, trans. Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (New York, Edinburgh and London, 1959), pp. 207-27, passim. Cf. also Bornkamm, Paul, p. 194; Whiteley, Theology, p. 193; Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (New York, London, 1958), pp. 254-56.

¹³Cf. Best, op. cit., pp. 184-86, 197-202; Cerfaux, op. cit., pp. 95, 203, 276-77; Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 310-11.

¹⁴See Best, op. cit., pp. 96, 104-105, 195; cf. Cerfaux, op. cit., 223-29, 276, 344; Whiteley, Theology, pp. 190-92.

¹⁵Cf. Best, op. cit., pp. 104, 189, and Cerfaux, op. cit., pp. 229, 231, on the relation of the local church to the total church. See also Barrett, I Cor., p. 32, II Cor., p. 55, and Best, Thess., pp. 61-62.

¹⁶See supra, p. 91.

¹⁷See supra, pp. 197-99. Cf. Richardson, Israel, p. 106; also Minear, Obedience, pp. 95-98.

¹⁸See supra, n. 2 to ch. 7, p. 307.

¹⁹See supra, pp. 111-12.

²⁰See supra, ch. 3, passim, especially pp. 60-80. See also Minear, Obedience, Appendix 1, pp. 91-101, and Appendix 2, pp. 102-10.

²¹See supra, chs. 2 and 3, passim, and pp. 166-73.

²²See supra, pp. 92-93, including n. 45 (pp. 271-72), 113-14.

²³See supra, pp. 88-90, 202-203.

²⁴See supra, pp. 90-91, including n. 42 (p. 271).

²⁵See supra, pp. 79-80, including n. 23 (pp. 265-66), 202-203, 216-17.

²⁶See supra, pp. 133-37, 217-18.

²⁷See supra, pp. 80-85; cf. pp. 60-80, especially 76-80, and 184-89.

²⁸See supra, pp. 204-206. ²⁹See supra, pp. 202-203.

³⁰Cf. Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 30.

³¹See supra, pp. 216-18.

³²See supra, chs. 4 and 5, passim, p. 215, including n. 66 (pp. 305-306); cf. n. 56 to ch. 6, p. 303.

³³See supra, ch. 5, especially pp. 153-73.

³⁴See supra, pp. 117-32. ³⁵See supra, chs. 4 and 5.

³⁶See supra, pp. 116, 166, including n. 29 (pp. 291-92).

³⁷See supra, pp. 79-80. ³⁸See supra, pp. 113-14.

³⁹See supra, pp. 86-88; cf. Minear, Obedience, pp. 104-105, 109-10.

⁴⁰See supra, pp. 115-16, 140-41, 216-17, including n. 72 (p. 306).

⁴¹See supra, pp. 113-14. ⁴²See supra, pp. 114-15.

⁴³See supra, pp. 115-16. ⁴⁴See supra, pp. 118-26.

⁴⁵See supra, pp. 127-29. ⁴⁶See supra, pp. 129-32.

⁴⁷See supra, pp. 133-37.

⁴⁸See supra, p. 136, including n. 84 (p. 286).

⁴⁹See supra, pp. 139-53. ⁵⁰See supra, pp. 151-53.

⁵¹See supra, pp. 212-13; cf. pp. 208-10.

⁵²See supra, pp. 158-73.

⁵³See supra, pp. 167-73, including notes, especially n. 32 (pp. 292-93).

⁵⁴See supra, pp. 204-206. See, e.g., on the question concerning those who abstained from eating meat (Rom. 14:2) or drinking wine (Rom. 14:21), Minear, Obedience, pp. 8-10; cf. the trouble that Paul himself experienced while eating at table with Jews and Gentiles at Antioch when certain ones came there from Jerusalem, see supra, p. 77, including nn. 19 and 20 (pp. 262-64).

⁵⁵See supra, pp. 67-79, passim.

⁵⁶See supra, pp. 204-206; cf. pp. 67-68.

⁵⁷See supra, pp. 80-85.

⁵⁸See supra, pp. 83-84, including n. 31 (pp. 268-69).

⁵⁹See supra, pp. 197-99; cf. pp. 200-202, 208-10. See also Minear, Obedience, pp. 109-10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts

Charles, Robert Henry, editor. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament: With Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. 2 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.

Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Translated by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

Epstein, I., editor. The Babylonian Talmud. 34 vols. and index. London: The Soncino Press, 1935-1952. Used: Sanhedrin. Translated by Jacob Shachter and H. Freedman. 2 vols. 1935.

Kittel, Rud., editor. Biblia Hebraica. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950.

Nestle, Erwin, and Kilpatrick, G. D., editors. Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. 2d ed., with revised critical apparatus. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958.

Rahlfs, Alfred, editor. Septuaginta. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1949.

The Holy Bible: Revised Standard Version containing the Old and New Testaments with the Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical Books: An Ecumenical Edition [The RSV Common Bible]. New York, London [etc.]: Collins, 1973.

Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. 1st published 1962. Reprinted with revisions, 1965. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd, 1965.

The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd; Cambridge: Harvard University Press:

Josephus. The Life; Against Apion; The Jewish War [B.J.]; Jewish Antiquities. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, Allen Wikgren, and L. H. Feldman. 9 vols.

Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker, and an index by W. Earp. 10 vols.

Pliny. Natural History. Translated by H. Rackham, W. H. S. Jones, and D. E. Eichholz. 10 vols.

Strabo. Geography. Translated by Horace L. Jones. 8 vols.

Suetonius. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. 2 vols.

Tacitus. Histories and Annals. Translated by C. H. Moore and J. Jackson. 4 vols.

References

Arndt, William Frederick, and Gingrich, Felix Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A translation and adaptation of the 4th revised ed. of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1957.

Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, Charles, editors. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic. Based on the lexicon of William Gesenius, as translated by Edward Robinson. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1907.

The Cambridge Ancient History. Edited by J. B. Bury et al. 12 vols. 1924-1939. Also 5 vols. of Plates, prepared by C. T. Seltman. Vol. X: The Augustan Empire: 44 B.C.-A.D. 20. 1st ed. 1934. Reprinted with corrections. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1971.

Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie. Publié par Fernand Cabrol, Henri Leclercq, et Henri Marrou. 15 Tomes. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1907-1953.

Hastings, James, editor. A Dictionary of the Bible. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898-1904.

_____, editor. Revised edition by Grant, Frederick Clifton and Rowley, Harold Henry. Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Kraeling, Emil Gottlieb Heinrich. Bible Atlas. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1956.

Liddell, Henry George, and Scott, Robert. A Greek-English Lexicon. A New Edition (9th). Revised and Augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1940.

Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. I: Prolegomena. 3rd ed. with corrections and additions. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908.

_____, and Milligan, George. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Limited, 1930.

Moulton, William Fiddian, and Geden, Alfred Sherington. A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers. 4th ed. revised by H. K. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung. Begonnen von Georg Wissowa. Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kroll. Vol. IX. 1. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1914.

Der Kleine Pauly Lexikon der Antike auf der Grundlage von Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Konrat Ziegler und Walther Southeimer. Bd. II. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag, 1967.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Gerhard Kittel, editor. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. In process: 8 vols. completed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964-1972.

Other Books and Articles

Allo, Ernest-Bernard. Saint Paul: Première Épître aux Corinthiens. Etudes Bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., Editeurs, 1934.

———. Saint Paul: Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens. Etudes Bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., Editeurs, 1937.

Anderson, Charles P. "Who Wrote 'The Epistle from Laodicea'?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (December, 1966), 436-40.

Askwith, E. H. "'I' and 'We' in the Thessalonian Epistles". The Expositor, Series 8, I (1911), 149-59.

Eahr, Gordon J. "Paul and Letter Writing in the Fifth [First] Century". The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVIII (1966), 465-77.

Bailey, John W. "The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians: Introduction and Exegesis". The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. XI, 243-339.

Baird, William. "What Is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor. 15:3-8 and Gal. 1:11-17". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (September, 1957), 181-91.

———. "Pauline Eschatology in Hermeneutical Perspective". New Testament Studies, XVII (April, 1971), 314-27.

Baldry, Harold Caparne. The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965.

Baron, Salo Wittmayer. A Social and Religious History of the Jews: Ancient Times. 2 vols., 2d ed., rev. and enlarged. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. "Ὁ ἀδικήσας (2. Cor. 7,12)". Verborum Veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von Otto Böcher und Klaus Haacker. Wuppertal: Theologischer Verlag Rolf Brockhaus, 1970. Pp. 149-58.

_____. "Cephas and Corinth". Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen in Gespräch über die Bibel. Festschrift für Otto Michel, zum 60. Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von Otto Betz, Martin Hengel, Peter Schmidt. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentum, V. Leiden/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1963. Pp. 1-12.

_____. "Christianity at Corinth". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XLVI (1963-1964), 269-97.

_____. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Reprinted with minor changes. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962.

_____. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968.

_____. A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1973.

_____. From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962.

_____. "I am Not Ashamed of the Gospel". Foi et Salut Selon S. Paul: (Épître aux Romains 1,16). Analecta Biblica: Investigationes Scientifica in Res Biblicas, No. 42. Rome: E. Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1970. Pp. 18-41.

_____, editor. The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. With introductions by the editor. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.

_____. "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles". Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953. Pp. 1-19.

_____. "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians". New Testament Studies, XVII (April, 1971), 233-54.

_____. "ψευδάνοχοι (2 Cor. 11.13)". Mélanges Bibliques: en hommage au R. P. Bédarigaux. Publiés sous la direction de Mgr Albert Descamps et du R. P. André de Halleux. Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, 1970. Pp. 377-96.

- _____. "Titus". Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black. Edited by Edward Earle Ellis, Max Wilcox. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969. Pp. 1-14.
- Barth, Karl. Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5. Translated by T. A. Smail. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 5. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956.
- _____. The Epistle to the Romans. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns from the 6th ed., with a new preface by the author. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Patey, Richard. "Paul's Interaction with the Corinthians". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV (June, 1965), 139-46.
- Beare, Francis Wright. "The Epistle to the Colossians: Introduction and Exegesis". The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. XI, 131-241.
- _____. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians. Black's New Testament Commentaries. 2d ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1969.
- Bell, H. Idris, editor. Jews and Christians in Egypt: The Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy. Illustrated by texts from the Greek papyri in the British Museum, with three Coptic texts edited by W. E. Crum. London: Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., and Oxford University Press, 1924.
- Benoit, Pierre. "Qumran and the New Testament". Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968. Pp. 1-30.
- Best, Ernest. "Bishops and Deacons: Philippians 1,1". Studia Evangelica, IV [see infra under F. M. Cross], 371-76.
- _____. A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1972.
- _____. The Letter of Paul to the Romans: Commentary. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967.
- _____. One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Betz, Otto. "Der Katechon". New Testament Studies, IX (April, 1963), 276-91.
- Beyer, Hermann Wolfgang. "Der Brief an die Galater". Neu bearbeitet von Paul Althaus. Die kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. In Verbindung

mit Hermann Wolfgang Beyer, et al. Herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Gerhard Friedrich. Bd. III. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963. Pp. 1-55.

_____. "δῑακονέω, δῑακονία, δῑάκονος". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. II, 81-93.

Blank, Sheldon H. "Studies in Post-Exilic Universalism". Hebrew Union College Annual, XI (1935), 159-91.

Blinzler, Josef. "The Jewish Punishment of Stoning in the New Testament Period". The Trial of Jesus: Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule. Edited by Ernst Bammel. Studies in Biblical Theology. 2d Series, No. 13. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1970. Pp. 145-61.

Boer, Willem Peter de. The Initiation of Paul: An Exegetical Study. Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam. Academisch Proefschrift. Kampen: J. H. Kok N.V., 1962.

Boers, Hendrikus. Theology Out of the Ghetto: A New Testament Exegetical Study Concerning Religious Exclusiveness. London: E. J. Brill, 1971.

Borg, Marcus. "A New Context for Romans XIII". New Testament Studies, XIX (January, 1973), 205-18.

Bornkamm, Günther. Early Christian Experience. Translated by Paul L. Hare. The New Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1969.

_____. "The History of the Origin of the So-Called Second Letter to the Corinthians". New Testament Studies, VIII (April, 1962), 258-64.

_____. Paul. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971.

_____. "Der Römerbrief als Testament des Paulus". Idem, Geschichte und Glaube. Zweiter Teil. Gesammelte Aufsätze, Bd. IV. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, Theologische Abhandlungen, herausgegeben von E. Wolf. Bd. 53. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971. Pp. 120-39.

_____. Die Vorgeschichte des sogenannten Zweiten Korintherbriefes. Vorgelegt am 6. Mai 1961. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1961, 2. Abhandlung. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. Universitätsverlag, 1961. (Now in, Idem, Geschichte und Glaube II [see supra, Idem, Römerbrief], pp. 16-22.)

Borsch, Frederick Houk. The Son of Man in Myth and History. The New Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1967.

Bouttier, Michel. Christianity According to Paul. Translated by

- Frank Clarke. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 49. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1966.
- Brandon, Samuel George Frederick. The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity. London: S.P.C.K, 1951.
- Bring, Ragnar. "Paul and the Old Testament: A Study of the ideas of Election, Faith and Law in Paul, with special reference to Romans 9:30-10:30". Studia Theologica, XXV (1971), 21-60.
- Broughton, T. R. S. "Roman Asia". An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. Edited by Tenney Frank. 5 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933-40. IV, 499-918.
- Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. "The Epistles of Paul". Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962. Pp. 927-39.
- _____. "Galatian Problems 1. Autobiographical Data". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, LI (Spring, 1969), 292-309.
- _____. "Galatian Problems 2. North or South Galatians?". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, LII (Spring, 1970), 243-66.
- _____. "Galatian Problems 3. The 'Other' Gospel". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, LIII (Spring, 1971), 253-71.
- _____. "Galatian Problems 4. The Date of the Epistle". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, LIV (Spring, 1972), 250-67.
- _____. "St. Paul in Rome". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XLVI (1963-1964), 326-45.
- Brunner, Heinrich Emil. The Letter to the Romans: A Commentary. Translated by H. A. Kennedy. London: Lutterworth Press; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.
- Buck, Charles H., Jr. "The Collection for the Saints". The Harvard Theological Review, XLIII (January, 1950), 1-29.
- _____. "The Date of Galatians". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (1951), 113-22.
- _____, and Taylor, Greer. Saint Paul: A Study of the Development of His Thought. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Bousset und Hermann Gunkel. 13. Heft. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

- _____. Theology of the New Testament. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1952-1955.
- Burton, Ernest DeWitt. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921.
- Bury, John Bagnell, et al. The Hellenistic Age: Aspects of Hellenistic Civilization. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1923.
- Cadbury, Henry Joel. The Book of Acts in History. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1955.
- _____. "A Qumran Parallel to Paul". The Harvard Theological Review, LI (January, 1958), 1-2.
- Caird, George Bradford. The Apostolic Age. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1955.
- _____. "The Chronology of the NT". The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et al. 4 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. I, 599a-607b.
- _____. "Paul and Women's Liberty". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, LIV (Spring, 1972), 268-81.
- _____. Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Campbell, John Young. "The Origin and Meaning of the Christian Use of the Word ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ". The Journal of Theological Studies, XLIX (July-October, 1948), 130-42. Republished and presented to him by his friends with an appreciation in idem, Three New Testament Studies. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965. Pp. 41-54.
- Campbell, Thomas H. "Paul's 'Missionary Journeys' as Reflected in His Letters". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (June, 1955), 80-87.
- Campanhausen, Hans von. Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries. Translated by J. A. Baker. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1969.
- Catchpole, D. R. "The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial". The Trial of Jesus: Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule. Edited by Ernst Bammel. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d Series, No. 13. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1970. Pp. 47-65.
- Cerfaux, Lucien. Christ in the Theology of St. Paul. Translated by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker. New York: Herder and Herder; Edinburgh and London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1959.

- _____. The Christian in the Theology of St. Paul. Translated by Lillian Soiron. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1967.
- _____. The Church in the Theology of St. Paul. Translated by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker. New York: Herder and Herder; Edinburgh and London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1959.
- Chadwick, Henry. "'All Things to All Men' (1 Cor. ix.22)". New Testament Studies, I (1954-1955), 261-75.
- _____. "I Thessalonians 3:3: $\sigma\alpha\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ". The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, I (October, 1950), 156-58.
- Charlesworth, Martin Percival. "Appendix: The Literary Authorities for Roman History". Cambridge Ancient History, X, 866-76.
- _____. "Gaius and Claudius". Cambridge Ancient History, X, 653-701.
- _____. "Tiberius". Cambridge Ancient History, X, 607-52.
- _____. Trade Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire. 2d ed., revised. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1926.
- Clemen, Carl. Paulus: sein Leben und Wirken. 1. Teil. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung [Alfred Töpelmann], 1904.
- Cochrane, Charles Norris. Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine. Galaxy Book, No. 7. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Collange, J.-F. Enigmes de la Deuxieme Epitre de Paul aux Corinthiens: Etude Exegetique de 2 Cor. 2:14-7:4. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, XVIII. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1972.
- Collins, John J. "Chiasmus, the 'ABA' Pattern and the Text of Paul". Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961. Analecta Biblica: Investigationes Scientifcae in Res Biblicas. 17-18. 2 vols. Rome: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963. II, 575-83.
- Conybeare, William John, and Howson, John Saul. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. 2 vols. New ed. London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1862.
- Conzelmann, Hans. "Current Problems in Pauline Research". Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology, XXII (April, 1968), 171-86.
- _____. "Paulus und die Weisheit". New Testament Studies, XII (April, 1966), 231-44.
- Coppens, Joseph. "'Mystery' in the theology of Saint Paul and its parallels at Qumran". Paul and Qumran: Studies in New

Testament Exegesis. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor.
London, Dublin, and Melbourne: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.
Pp. 132-58.

Craig, Clarence Tucker. "The First Epistle to the Corinthians: Introduction and Exegesis". The Interpreter's Bible.
Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. X, 1-262.

Cranfield, C. E. B. "ΜΕΤΡΟΝ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in Romans xii.3".
New Testament Studies, VIII (July, 1962), 345-51.

_____. "St. Paul and the Law". Scottish Journal of Theology,
XVII (March, 1964), 43-68.

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1958.

_____, editor. Studia Evangelica, IV. Papers presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965. Part I: The New Testament Scriptures. Deutsch Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Institut für griechisch-romische altertumskunde Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte. Text und Untersuchungen: zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Begründet von O. von Gebhardt und A. von Harnack. Bd. 102. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.

Cullmann, Oscar. "Le caractère eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de S. Paul: Étude sur le ΚΑΤΕΧΟΝ (-ΩΝ) de 2. Thess. 2:6-7". Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, XVI (1936), 210-45.

_____. Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. SCM Cheap Edition. Rev. ed. (1962) with a new introductory chapter. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962.

_____. The Early Church. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Translated by A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1956.

_____. Salvation in History. Translation drafted by Sidney G. Sowers and completed by the editorial staff of the SCM Press. The New Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1967.

_____. "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research Into the Beginnings of Christianity". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (December, 1955), 213-26. Reprinted in The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957. Pp. 18-32.

_____. The State in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.

- Dahl, M. E. The Resurrection of the Body. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 36. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "The Atonement--an Adequate Reward for the Akedah? (Ro 8:32)". Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black. Edited by E. Earle Ellis, Max Wilcox. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969. Pp. 15-29.
- _____. "Paul and the Church at Corinth according to 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21". Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. Edited by W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967. Pp. 313-35.
- Dalbert, Peter. Die Theologie der Hellenistisch-Jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus. Theologische Forschung, Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre. Vierte Veröffentlichung. Hamburg-Volksdorf: Herbert Reich. Evangelischer Verlag, 1954.
- Davies, Paul E. "The Macedonian Scene of Paul's Journeys". The Biblical Archaeologist, XXVI (September, 1963), 91-106.
- Davies, William David. "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit". The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957. Pp. 157-82.
- _____. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. 2d ed. with additional notes. London: S.P.C.K, 1955.
- _____. Review of Paulus und Die Heilsgeschichte, by Johannes Munck. New Testament Studies, II (September, 1955), 60-72.
- _____. Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, VII. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.
- Deissmann, Adolf. Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. New and completely revised edition with eighty-five illustrations from the latest German edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton Publishers, 1927.
- _____. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History. Translated by William E. Wilson. 2d ed., fully revised and enlarged. London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1926.
- _____. "Die Sprache der griechischen Bibel". Theologische Rundschau. 5. Jahrgang (Januar bis Dezember 1902), 58-69.
- Delcor, Mathias. "The courts of the Church of Corinth and the courts of Qumran". Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. London,

- Dublin, and Melbourne: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968. Pp. 69-84.
- DeWitt, Norman Wentworth. St. Paul and Epicurus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.
- De Young, James Calvin. Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology. Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam. Academisch Proefschrift. Kampen: J. H. Kok N.V., 1960.
- Dibelius, Martin. An die Thessalonicher I II an die Philipper. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 11. Zweite, Völlig neu Bearbeitete Auflage. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1925.
- _____. Paul. Edited and completed by Werner Georg Kümmel. Translated by Frank Clarke. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.
- _____. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. Translated by Mary Ling; chapter 4 translated by Paul Schubert. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1956.
- Dick, Karl. Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1900.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. Die Thessalonicher-Briefe. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, begründet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. 10. Abt. 7. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1909.
- Dockx, S. "Chrorologie de la vie de Saint Paul, depuis sa conversion jusqu'à son séjour à Rome". Novum Testamentum, XIII (October 1971), 261-304.
- Dodd, Charles Harold. According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology. London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1952.
- _____. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development. With an appendix on Eschatology and History. 3rd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963.
- _____. The Coming of Christ: Four Broadcast Addresses for the Season of Advent. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1951.
- _____. "ΕΝΝΟΜΟΙ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ". Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953. Pp. 96-110.
- _____. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1932.
- _____. "The Historical Problem of the Death of Jesus". More New

Testament Studies. Idem. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968. Pp. 84-101.

_____. "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XVIII (January, 1934), 69-110. Republished in idem, New Testament Studies. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953. Pp. 83-128.

_____. "The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XVII (January, 1933), 91-105. Republished in idem, New Testament Studies. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953. Pp. 67-82.

Doeve, J. W. "Some Notes with Reference to ΤΑ ΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ in Romans III 2". Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953. Pp. 111-23.

Duncan, George Simpson. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.

_____. "The Epistles of the Imprisonment in Recent Discussion". The Expository Times, XLVI (April, 1935), 293-98.

_____. St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry: A Reconstruction with Special Reference to the Ephesian Origin of the Imprisonment Epistles. London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1929.

_____. "Were Paul's Imprisonment Epistles written from Ephesus?". The Expository Times, LXVII (March, 1956), 163-66.

Dungan, David L. The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

Edersheim, Alfred. "Jewish Views on Trade, Tradesmen, and Trades' Guilds". Sketches of Jewish Social Life: In the days of Christ. Idem. London: Pickering & Inglis Ltd., [1876]. Reprinted in U.S.A., 1960. Pp. 182-98.

Eichholz, Georg. "Der ökumenische und missionarische Horizont der Kirche: Eine exegetische Studie zu Röm. 1,8-15". Evangelische Theologie, Heft 1 (München: Januar, 1961), 15-27.

Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by J. A. Baker. The Old Testament Library. 2 vols. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1961-1967.

Ellis, Edward Earle. "Paul and His Co-Workers". New Testament Studies, XVII (July, 1971), 437-52.

_____. Paul and His Recent Interpreters. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1961.

_____. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh and London:

Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

_____. "Those of the Circumcision and the Early Christian Mission". Studia Evangelica, IV [see supra under F. M. Cross], 390-99.

Enslin, Morton Scott. Reapproaching Paul. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972.

Evans, Christopher Francis. In "Discussion" following C. K. Barrett's paper, "I am Not Ashamed of the Gospel". Foi et Salut Selon S. Paul: (Epître aux Romains 1,16). Analecta Biblica: Investigationes Scientifical in Res Biblicas, No. 42. Rome: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1970. Pp. 46-47.

_____. "I Will Go Before You into Galilee". The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, V (April, 1954), 3-18.

_____. "The Kerygma". The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, VII (1956), 25-41.

_____. Resurrection and the New Testament. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d Series, No. 12. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1970.

_____. "'Speeches' in Acts". Mélanges Bibliques: en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux. Publiés sous la direction de Mgr Albert Descamps et du R. P. André de Halleux. Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, S. A., 1970. Pp. 287-302.

Farmer, William Reuben. Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

Faw, Chalmer E. "The Anomaly of Galatians". Biblical Research, IV (1960), 25-38.

Filson, Floyd V. "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: Introduction and Exegesis". Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. X, 263-425.

Findlay, George Gillanders. "The Letter of the Corinthian Church to St. Paul". The Expositor, 6th Series, I (1900), 401-407.

_____. "Paul the Apostle". A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. III, 696b-731a.

_____. "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians". The Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. 5 vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897-1910. II, 727-953.

Finegan, Jack. "The Original Form of the Pauline Collection". The Harvard Theological Review, XLIX (April, 1956), 85-103.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "A Feature of Qumran angelology and the angels

- of 1 Cor 11:10". Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. London, Dublin, and Melbourne: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968. Pp. 31-47. First published in New Testament Studies, IV (1957-1958), 48-58.
- _____. "'To Know Him and the Power of His Resurrection' (Phil. 3.10)". Mélanges Bibliques: en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux. Publiés sous la direction de Mgr Albert Descamps et du R. P. André de Halleux. Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, S. A., 1970. Pp. 411-25.
- _____. "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and Their Literature". The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1957. Pp. 208-31.
- Flusser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity". Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin. Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV. 2d edition. Jerusalem: At the Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1965. Pp. 215-66.
- Foakes-Jackson, Frederick John. The Acts of the Apostles. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Limited; New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1931.
- _____, and Lake, Kirsopp, editors. The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920-1933.
- Forbes, R. J. Studies in Ancient Technology. Vol. IV, 2d revised ed.; Vol. V, 2d ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964, 1966.
- Frame, James Everett. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.
- Frank, Tenney, editor. An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. 5 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933-1940
- Fraser, John W. "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: II Corinthians V.16 once more". New Testament Studies, XVII (April, 1971), 293-313.
- Friedrich, Gerhard. "Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief". Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel. Festschrift für Otto Michel, zum 60. Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von Otto Betz, Martin Hengel, Peter Schmidt. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentum, V. Leiden/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1963. Pp. 181-215.
- Fuchs, Ernst. "On the Task of a Christian Theology: On Ernst Käsemann's Essay, 'The Beginnings of Christian Theology'". Journal for Theology and the Church, VI: Apocalypticism

(1969), 69-98.

_____. Studies of the Historical Jesus. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 42. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964.

Funk, Robert. "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance". Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. Edited by W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967. Pp. 249-68.

Furnish, Victor. "The Place and Purpose of Philippians III". New Testament Studies, X (October, 1963), 80-88.

Gager, John G., Jr. "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIX (September, 1970), 325-37.

Gaston, Lloyd. No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, XXIII. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

Georgi, Dieter. Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur Religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum alten und neuen Testament, XI. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verläg des Erziehungsvereins G.m.b.H., 1964.

_____. Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem. Theologische Forschung: Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre, XXXVIII. Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich, Evangelischer Verläg GmbH, 1965.

Gerhardsson, Birger. Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, XXII. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup; Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1961.

Geyser, A. S. "Paul, the Apostolic Decree and the Liberals in Corinth". Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953. Pp. 124-38.

Gibbs, John G. Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, XXVI. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.

Gnilka, Joachim. "Geistliches Amt und Gemeinde nach Paulus". Foi et Salut selon S. Paul: (Épître aux Romains 1,16). Analecta Biblica: Investigationes Scientificaee in Res Biblicas, No. 42. Rome: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1970. Pp. 233-45.

_____. "2 Cor. 6:14-7:1 in the light of the Qumran texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs". Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. London, Dublin, and Melbourne: Geoffrey

Chapman, 1968. Pp. 56-68.

Goguel, Maurice. Introduction au Nouveau Testament, IV, 2^e Partie: Les Épîtres Pauliniennes. Paris: Éditions Ernest Leroux, 1926.

_____. "La vision de Paul à Corinthe et sa comparution devant Gallion". Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, XII (1932), 321-33.

_____. The Primitive Church. Translated by H. C. Snape. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1964.

Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson. The Meaning of Ephesians. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933.

_____. New Solutions of New Testament Problems. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927.

_____. "Phoebe's Letter of Introduction". The Harvard Theological Review, XLIV, No. 1 (1951), 55-57.

Grant, Frederick Clifton. Ancient Judaism and the New Testament. 2d ed. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1960.

_____. Roman Hellenism and the New Testament. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.

Grant, Robert McQueen. A Historical Introduction to the New Testament. London: Collins; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.

Gray, George Buchanan. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX. Vol. I, Introduction, and Commentary on I-XXVII. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

Grosheide, F. W. "The Pauline Epistles as Kerygma". Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953. Pp. 139-45.

Guignebert, Ch. The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. The History of Civilization. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Company Inc., 1939.

Gutbrod, Walter. "Εἰσαίτος". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. III, 389-91.

_____. Die Paulinische Anthropologie. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament. 4. Folge, Heft 15. Stuttgart-Berlin: W. Kohlhammer. Verlag, 1934.

Haenchen, Ernst. The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary. Translated by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn, under the supervision of Hugh Anderson, and with the translation revised

and brought up to date by R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

Hahn, Ferdinand. Mission in the New Testament. Translated by Frank Clarke. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 47. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1965.

_____. The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity. Translated by Harold Knight and George Ogg. Lutterworth Library. London: Lutterworth Press, 1969.

Harnack, Adolf. The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Translated and edited by James Moffatt. 2d, enlarged and revised ed. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.

_____. "Das Problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs". Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 16 Juni Sitzung der philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1910. Berlin: Verlag der Königlischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1910. Pp. 560-77.

Harrison, J. "Saint Paul's Letters to the Corinthians". The Expository Times, LXXVII (1965-1966), 285-86.

Harrison, Percy Neale. "Onesimus and Philemon". Anglican Theological Review, XXXII (January, 1950), 268-94.

Harvey, A. E. "The Opposition to Paul". Studia Evangelica, IV [see supra under F. M. Cross], 319-32.

Harvey, Van Austin. The Historian and the Believer: The Morality of Historical Knowledge and Christian Belief. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1967.

Hay, David M. "Paul's Indifference to Authority". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVIII (March, 1969), 36-44.

Heidel, Alexander. The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of Creation. 2d ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1951.

Héring, Jean. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. Translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.

_____. The Second Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. Translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: Epworth Press, 1967.

_____. "Saint Paul a-t-il enseigné deux résurrections?". Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, XII (1932), 300-320.

Hoennicke, Gustav. Die Chronologie des Lebens des Apostels Paulus. Leipzig: U. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf. (Georg

Böhme), 1903.

Hooker, Morna D. "Authority on her Head: An Examination of I Cor. xi.10". New Testament Studies, X (April, 1964), 410-16.

_____. "'Beyond the Things which are Written': An Examination of I Cor. iv.6". New Testament Studies, X (October, 1963), 127-32.

_____. Review of The Chronology of the Life of Paul, by George Ogg. Church Quarterly, II (October, 1969), 168.

_____. The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and its use in St Mark's Gospel. London: S.P.C.K, 1967.

Houlden, J. L. Paul's Letters from Prison: Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians. The Pelican New Testament Commentaries. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1970.

Howard, George. "Romans 3:21-31 and the Inclusion of the Gentiles". The Harvard Theological Review, LXIII (April, 1970), 223-33.

Hurd, John Coolidge, Jr. The Origin of I Corinthians. London: S.P.C.K, 1965.

_____. "Pauline Chronology and Pauline Theology". Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. Edited by W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967. Pp. 225-48.

Jacob, Edmond. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1958.

Jeremias, Joachim. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period. Translated by F. H. and C. H. Clave. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1969.

_____. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1958.

_____. "Paul and James". The Expository Times, LXVI (1954-1955), 368-71.

_____. "Zöllner und Sünder". Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche, XXX (1931), 293-300.

Jervell, Jacob. "Der Brief nach Jerusalem: Über Veranlassung und Adresse des Römerbriefes". Studia Theologica, XXV, No. 1 (1971), 61-73.

Jewett, Robert. "The Agitators and the Galatian Congregation". New Testament Studies, XVII (January, 1971), 198-212.

- Johnson, Lewis. "The Pauline Letters from Caesarea". The Expository Times, LXVIII (October, 1956), 24-26.
- Johnson, Sherman E. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts". The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957. Pp. 129-42.
- _____. "Notes and Comments". Anglican Theological Review, XXIII (April, 1941), 173-76.
- _____. "Paul and the Manual of Discipline". The Harvard Theological Review, XLVIII (July, 1955), 157-65.
- Johnston, George. "ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗ and ΚΟΣΜΟΣ in the New Testament". New Testament Studies, X (April, 1964), 352-60.
- Jones, A. H. M. The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "The Beginnings of Christian Theology". Journal for Theology and the Church, VI: Apocalypticism (1969), 17-46.
- _____. Essays on New Testament Themes. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 41. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964.
- _____. Die Legitimität des Apostels: Eine Untersuchung zu II Korinther 10-13. [First published in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLI (1942), 33-71. Reprinted from the Darmstadt edition, 1956, in:] Sonderausgabe, Reihe "Libelli", Bd. XXXIII. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.
- _____. "On the Topic of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic". Journal for Theology and the Church, VI: Apocalypticism (1969), 99-133.
- _____. Perspectives on Paul. Translated by Margaret Kohl. The New Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1971.
- Kennedy, A. R. S., revised by Roberts, B. J. "Crimes and Punishments". Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings, revised edition by Frederick C. Grant and H. H. Rowley. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963. Pp. 189-90.
- Kijne, J. J. "We, Us and Our in I and II Corinthians". Novum Testamentum, VIII (April-October, 1966), 171-79.
- Kinoshita, Junji. "Romans--Two Writings Combined: A New Interpretation of the Body of Romans". Novum Testamentum, VII (1965), 258-77.
- Kissane, Edward J. The Book of Isaiah, I. 1st revised ed. Dublin: Browne and Nolan Limited, 1960.
- Kittel, Gerhard. "αἰχμάλωτος, . . ." Theological Dictionary of

- the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. I, 195-97.
- Klausner, Joseph. From Jesus to Paul. Translated by William F. Stinespring. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1944.
- Klein, Günter. "Der Abfassungszweck des Römerbriefes". Rekonstruktion und Interpretation: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament. Idem. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, Theologische Abhandlungen. Bd. 50. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1969. Pp. 129-44.
- Knowling, R. J. "The Acts of the Apostles". The Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. 5 vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897-1910. II, 1-554.
- Knox, John. Chapters in the Life of Paul. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1954.
- _____. "The Epistle to Philemon: Introduction and Exegesis". The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. XI, 553-73.
- _____. "The Epistle to the Romans: Introduction and Exegesis". The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. IX, 353-668.
- _____. "'Fourteen Years Later': A Note on the Pauline Chronology". The Journal of Religion, XVI (July, 1936), 341-49.
- _____. Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- _____. "A Note on the Text of Romans". New Testament Studies, II (February, 1956), 191-93.
- _____. "The Pauline Chronology". Journal of Biblical Literature, LVIII (1939), 15-29.
- _____. Philemon Among the Letters of Paul: A New View of its Place and Importance. Revised ed. New York and Nashville: Abingdom Press, 1959. London: Collins, 1960.
- _____. "Philemon and the Authenticity of Colossians". The Journal of Religion, XVIII (April, 1938), 144-60.
- _____. "Romans 15:14-33 and Paul's Conception of His Apostolic Mission". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (March, 1964), 1-11.
- Knox, Wilfred Lawrence. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1939.
- _____. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge: At the

University Press, 1925.

Köhler, Ludwig. Hebrew Man, with an appendix on Justice in the Gate. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1956.

Koenig, John. Review of Saint Paul: A Study in the Development of His Thought, by Charles Buck and Greer Taylor. Union Seminary Quarterly Review, XXV (Spring, 1970), 368-71.

Koester, Helmut. "ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity". The Harvard Theological Review, LVIII (July, 1965), 279-318.

_____. "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment (Philippians III)". New Testament Studies, VIII (July, 1962), 317-32.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. Introduction to the New Testament. Founded by Paul Feine and Johannes Behm. Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr., in collaboration with the author. The New Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1966.

_____. "Das literarische und geschichtliche Problem des ersten Thessalonicherbriefes". Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, VI. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962. Pp. 213-27.

_____. Man in the New Testament. Translated by John J. Vincent. Revised and enlarged ed. London: The Epworth Press, 1963.

Lagrange, Marie Joseph. Saint Paul: Épitre aux Galates. Études Bibliques. 2^e éd. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1925.

_____. Saint Paul: Épitre aux Romains. Études Bibliques. 2^e éd. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1930.

Lake, Kirsopp. "The Chronology of Acts". The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920-1933. V, 445-74.

_____. The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul: Their Motive and Origin. London: Rivingtons, 1911.

_____. "The End of Paul's Trial in Rome". Theologisch Tijdschrift, Jahrgang 47 (Leiden: 1913), 356-65.

_____, and Cadbury, Henry Joel. English Translation and Commentary. Vol. IV of The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1920-1933.

Lampe, Geoffrey W. H. St. Luke and the Church of Jerusalem. London: University of London, The Athlone Press, 1969.

Larsen, J. A. O. "Roman Greece". An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. Edited by Tenney Frank. 5 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933-40. IV, 259-498.

Leenhardt, Franz J. The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. Biblical Essays. 2d ed. London: Macmillan and Co. Limited; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904.

_____. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations. 10th ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1890.

_____. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations. 8th ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1885.

Lofthouse, W. R. "'I' and 'We' in the Pauline Letters". The Expository Times, LXIV (May, 1953), 241-45.

_____. "Singular and Plural in St. Paul's Letters". The Expository Times, LVIII (April, 1947), 179-82.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. Der Brief an die Philipper. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begründet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. 9. Abt. (1), 13. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

Lohse, Eduard. Colossians and Philemon: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon. Translated by William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris. Edited by Helmut Koester. Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

_____. "Pauline Theology in the Letter to the Colossians". New Testament Studies, XV (1968-1969), 211-20.

Longenecker, Richard Norman. The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d Series, No. 17. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1970.

McDonald, J. I. H. "Was Romans xvi a Separate Letter?". New Testament Studies, XVI, No. 4 (1969-1970), 369-72.

Macgregor, George Hogarth Carnaby. "The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction and Exegesis". The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. IX, 1-352.

_____. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought". New Testament Studies, I (September, 1954), 17-28.

- McNeile, Alan Hugh. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. 2d ed. revised by C. S. C. Williams. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1953.
- MacRae, G. W. "Anti-Dualistic Polemic in 2 Cor. 4,6?". Studia Evangelica, IV [see supra under F. M. Cross], 420-31.
- Madden, Frederic W. History of Jewish Coinage, and of Money in the Old and New Testament, with 254 Woodcuts and a Plate of Alphabets by F. W. Fairholt. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1864.
- Manson, Thomas Walter. "St. Paul in Ephesus: The Date of the Epistle to the Philippians". Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXIII (April, 1939), 182-200. Republished in idem, Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Pp. 149-67.
- _____. Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Edited by Matthew Black, with a memoir of T. W. Manson by H. H. Rowley. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962.
- _____. "2 Cor. 2:14-17: Suggestions Towards an Exegesis". Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953. Pp. 155-62.
- Martin, Ralph P. Carmen Christi: Philippians ii.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, No. 4. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967.
- Marxsen, Willi. Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to its Problems. Translated by G. Buswell. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- Masson, Charles. L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, X. Neuchatel/Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé S.A., 1950.
- Menoud, Philippe-Henri. "Le plan des Actes des Apôtres". New Testament Studies, I (September, 1954), 44-51.
- Metzger, Bruce M. The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration. 2d ed. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Meyers, Eric M., Kraabel, Thomas A., and Strange, James F. "Archaeology and the Rabbinic Tradition at Khirbet Shema': 1970-1971 Campaigns". The Biblical Archaeologist, XXXV (February, 1972), 1-31.
- Michael, J. Hugh. The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Bern: Berchtold Haller Verlag, 1946.

- _____. "σκηνοποιός". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. VII, pp. 393-94.
- Michel, Otto. Der Brief an die Römer. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begründet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. 4. Abt., 10. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.
- _____. "ἡ οἰκουμένη". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. V, 157-59.
- Milligan, George. St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1908.
- Minear, Paul Sevier. "Christian Eschatology and Historical Methodology". Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinen siebzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche. Beiheft XXI. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954. Pp. 15-23.
- _____. Images of the Church in the New Testament. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- _____. "The Jerusalem Fund and Pauline Chronology". Anglican Theological Review, XXV (October, 1943), 389-96.
- _____. The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d Series, No. 19. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1971.
- Mitton, Charles Leslie. The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters. London: The Epworth Press, 1955.
- Moehring, H. R. "Some Remarks on σάρξ in Philippians 3,3ff.". Studia Evangelica, IV [see supra under F. M. Cross], 432-36.
- Moffatt, James. "The First and Second Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians". The Expositor's Greek Testament. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. 5 vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897-1910. IV, 1-54.
- Mommsen, Theodor, The Provinces of the Roman Empire: From Caesar to Diocletian. Translated by William P. Dickinson in 1886, reprinted with corrections, 1909. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1909.
- Moore, Arthur Lewis. The Parousia in the New Testament. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, XIII. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-1930.
- Morton, Andrew Queen, and McLeman, James. Paul, the Man and the Myth: A Study in the Authorship of Greek Prose. London:

Hodder and Stoughton, 1966.

Mossé, Claude. The Ancient World at Work. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Ancient Culture and Society. London: Chatto & Windus, 1969.

Moule, Charles Francis Digby. "Death 'to Sin', 'to Law', and 'to the World': A Note on Certain Datives". Mélanges Bibliques: en hommage au R. P. Bédaride Rigaux. Publiés sous la direction de Mgr Albert Descamps et du R. P. André de Halleux. Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, S.A., 1970. Pp. 367-75.

_____. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon: An Introduction and Commentary. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1962.

_____. "Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5-11". Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Exeter, Devon: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Pp. 264-76.

_____. "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul". Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. Edited by W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967. Pp. 389-406.

_____. The Phenomenon of the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Implications of Certain Features of the New Testament. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d Series, No. 1. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1967.

_____. "St. Paul and Dualism: The Pauline Conception of Resurrection". New Testament Studies, XII (January, 1966), 106-23.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. He that Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956.

Nowry, Lucetta. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Muilenburg, James. "Isaiah, Chapters 40-66: Introduction and Exegesis". The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. V, 381-773.

_____. The Way of Israel: Biblical Faith and Ethics. Religious Perspectives, V. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1961; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1962.

Munck, Johannes. "I Thess. I.9-10 and the Missionary Preaching of Paul: Textual Exegesis and Hermeneutic Reflexions". New Testament Studies, IX (January, 1963), 95-110.

_____. "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament". The

Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, II (April, 1951), 3-16.

_____. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1959.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Paul and Qumran". Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. London, Dublin, and Melbourne: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968. Pp. 179-230.

Neil, William. The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1950.

Nickle, Keith F. The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 48. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1966.

Noack, Bent. "Current and Backwater in the Epistle to the Romans". Studia Theologica, XIX (1965), 155-66.

Nock, Arthur Darby. Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1933.

Nygren, Anders. Commentary on Romans. Translated by Carl C. Rasmussen. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1952.

Oertel, F. "The Economic Unification of the Mediterranean Region: Industry, Trade, and Commerce". Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. X: The Augustan Empire: 44 B.C.-A.D. 70. Pp. 382-424.

Ogg, George. The Chronology of the Life of Paul. London: Epworth Press, 1968.

_____. "Chronology of the New Testament". Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962. Pp. 728-32.

_____. "A New Chronology of Saint Paul's Life". The Expository Times, LXIV (1952-1953), 120-23.

O'Neill, J. C. "The Charge of Blasphemy at Jesus' Trial Before the Sanhedrin". The Trial of Jesus: Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule. Edited by Ernst Bammel. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2d Series, No. 13. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1970. Pp. 72-77.

_____. The Recovery of Paul's Letter to the Galatians. London: S.P.C.K., 1972.

_____. The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting. 2d ed. revised and supplemented. London: S.P.C.K., 1970.

Oostendorp, Derk William. Another Jesus: A Gospel of Jewish-Christian Superiority in II Corinthians. Academisch Proefschrift.

Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam. Kampen: J. H. Kok N.V., 1967.

Osborne, Robert E. "St. Paul's Silent Years". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV (March, 1965), 59-65.

Otto, Rudolf. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion. Translated by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf. New and revised ed. Lutterworth Library, IX. London: Lutterworth Press, 1943.

Pedersen, Johs. Israel: Its Life and Culture. 4 vols. London: Geoffrey Cumberledge, Oxford University Press, 1926-1940.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. History of New Testament Times: With an Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.

Pfittzner, Victor C. Paul and the Agon Motif: Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, XVI. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915.

Rad, Gerhard von. Genesis: A Commentary. Translated by John H. Marks. The Old Testament Library. 3d rev. ed. London: SCM Press Ltd; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.

Ramsay, William Mitchell. The Church in the Roman Empire: Before A.D. 170. 5th ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927.

_____. "Roads and Travel (in NT)". A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. V, 375-402.

_____. St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. 8th ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905.

_____, and Eb. Nestle. In "Requests and Replies". The Expository Times, VIII (1896-1897), 109, 153-54.

Redlich, E. Basil. S. Paul and His Companions. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1913.

Reicke, Bo. "Caesarea, Rome and the Captivity Epistles". Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Article translated by Manfred Kwiran and W. Ward Gasque. Exeter, Devon: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Pp. 277-86.

_____. "The Law and this World according to Paul: Some thoughts concerning Gal. 4:1-11". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (December, 1951), 259-76.

_____. The New Testament Era: The World of the Bible from 500

B.C. to A.D. 100. Translated by David E. Green. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1969.

_____. "Unité Chrétienne et Diaconie: Phil. ii 1-11". Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag Überreicht. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, VI. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962. Pp. 203-12.

Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich. "ἀπόστολος". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. I, 407-45.

_____. "δοῦλος . . .". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. II, 261-80.

Rice, Tamara Talbot. The Scythians. Ancient People and Places, II. 2d ed. London: Thames and Hudson, 1958.

Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd; New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1958.

Richardson, H. Neil. "Some Notes on 1QSa". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (June, 1957), 108-22.

Richardson, Peter. Israel in the Apostolic Church. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, X. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969.

Riddle, Donald Wayne. Paul Man of Conflict: A Modern Biographical Sketch. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1940.

Rigaux, Bêda. Saint Paul et ses Lettres: État de la question. Studia Neotestamentica, Subsidia II. Paris-Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1962.

_____. Saint Paul: Les Épitres aux Thessaloniens. Études Bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Éditeurs; Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, S.A., 1956.

Rissi, Mathias. Studien zum Zweiten Korintherbrief: Der alte Bund--Der Prediger--Der Tod. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Herausgegeben von O. Cullmann und H. J. Stoebe. Band LVI. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1969.

Robertson, Archibald, and Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians. The International Critical Commentary. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914.

Robinsen, John A. T. "The Most Primitive Christology of All?". The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, VII (October, 1956), 177-89. Also in idem, Twelve New Testament Studies. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 34. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1962. Pp. 139-53.

Robson, E. Iliff. "Composition and Dictation in N.T. Books". The

Journal of Theological Studies, XVIII (July, 1917), 288-301.

Roller, Otto. Das Formular der Paulischen Briefe: Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom antiken Briefe. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, Begründet von Rudolf Kittel, Herausgegeben von Albrect Alt und Gerhard Kittel. 4. Folge, Heft 6. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer. Verlag, 1933.

Rostovtzeff, M. The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. 2 vols. 2d ed. revised by P. M. Fraser. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957.

Rowley, Harold Henry. The Biblical Doctrine of Election. London: Lutterworth Press, 1950.

Rowlingson, Donald T. "The Geographical Orientation of Paul's Missionary Interests". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIX (1950), 341-44.

_____. "Paul's Ephesian Imprisonment: An Evaluation of the Evidence". Anglican Theological Review, XXXII (January, 1950), 1-7.

Russell, David Syme. The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 BC - AD 100. The Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964.

Sahlin, Harold. "The New Exodus of Salvation According to St. Paul". The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology. Anton Fridrichsen et al. London: Dacre Press, A. & C. Black Ltd, 1953. Pp. 81-95.

Sanday, William, and Headlam, Arthur Cayley. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The International Critical Commentary. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.

Sanders, Ed Parish. "Literary Dependence in Colossians". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (March, 1966), 28-45.

Sanders, J. A. "Dissenting Deities and Philippians 2:1-11". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVIII (September, 1969), 279-90.

Sanders, Jack T. The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, XV. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1971.

_____. "Paul's 'Autobiographical' Statements in Galatians 1-2". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (September, 1966), 335-43.

Sass, Gerhard. "Zur Bedeutung von σοφλος bei Paulus". Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, XL (1941), 24-32.

Sasse, Hermann. "κόσμος". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. III, 868-95.

Schippers, R. "The Pre-Synoptic Tradition in I Thessalonians II 13-16". Novum Testamentum, VIII (April-October, 1966), 223-34.

Schlier, Heinrich. Der Brief an die Galater. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begründet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. 7. Abt., 12. neubearbeitete Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

_____. Principalities and Powers in the New Testament. Quaestiones Disputatae, No. 3. Edinburgh-London: Nelson, [1961]. German edition, Mächte und Gewalten im Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1961.

_____. The Relevance of the New Testament. Translated by W. J. O'Hara. London: Burns & Oates Limited; New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. "ἐθνος in the NT". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. II, 369-72.

Schmithals, Walter. Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen. 2. neu bearbeitete Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.

_____. "Die Häretiker in Galatien". Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, XLVII (1956), 25-67. Reprinted in revised form in idem, Paulus und die Gnostiker: Untersuchungen zu den kleinen Paulusbriefen. Theologische Forschung. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre, 35. Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich. Evangelischer Verlag GmbH, 1965. Pp. 9-46.

_____. "Die Irrlehrer des Philipperbriefes". Paulus und die Gnostiker: Untersuchungen zu den kleinen Paulusbriefen. Idem. Theologische Forschung. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre, 35. Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich. Evangelischer Verlag GmbH, 1965. Pp. 47-87.

_____. The Office of Apostle in the Early Church. Translated by John E. Steely. London: S.P.C.K., 1971.

_____. Paul and James. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 46. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1965.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Apostles Before and During Paul's Time". Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday. Edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Article translated by Manfred Kwiran and W. Ward Gasque. Exeter, Devon: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Pp. 287-303.

_____. The Church in the New Testament. Translated by W. J.

O'Hara. London: Burns & Oates Limited; New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

Schoeps, Hans-Joachim. Jewish Christianity: Factional Disputes in the Early Church. Translated by Douglas R. A. Haro. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

_____. Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.

Schubert, Kurt. "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts". The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957. Pp. 118-28.

Schubert, Paul. Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgiving. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche. Beiheft 20. Berlin: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1939.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Translated by William Montgomery, with a prefatory note by F. C. Burkitt. 2d ed. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953.

Schweizer, Eduard Robert. "The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ". Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963. Idem. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963. Pp. 317-29.

_____. Church Order in the New Testament. Translated by Frank Clarke. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 32. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1961.

_____. "The Disciples of Jesus and the Post-Resurrection Church". Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963. Idem. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963. Pp. 239-53.

_____. Jesus. Translated by David E. Green. The New Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1971.

_____. Lordship and Discipleship. Translated with revisions by the author. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 28. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1960.

_____. Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951-1963. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1963.

Scott, Ernest F. "The Epistle to the Philippians: Introduction and Exegesis". The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. XI, 1-129.

Scroggs, Robin. The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.

Selby, Donald Joseph. Toward the Understanding of Paul. Englewood

- Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.
- Sevenster, Jan Nicolaas. Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known?. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, XIX. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.
- _____. Paul and Seneca. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, IV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- _____. "Some Remarks on the ΓΥΜΝΟΞ in II Cor. V.3". Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953. Pp. 202-14.
- Shedd, Russell Phillip. Man in Community: A Study of St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- Sherwin-White, A. N. Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament. First published 1963. Reprinted from corrected sheets of the first edition, 1965, 1969 (with additional Note). Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Simon, Ulrich E. A Theology of Salvation: A Commentary on Isaiah 40-55. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.
- Smith, Morton. "Pauline Problems: Apropos of J. Munck, 'Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte'". The Harvard Theological Review, L (April, 1957), 107-31.
- Snape, Henry Currie. "The Fourth Gospel, Ephesus, and Alexandria". The Harvard Theological Review, XLVII (January, 1954), 1-14.
- Soden, Hans Freiherr von. "ἀρετὴς . . ." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. I, 144-46.
- Sprague, Rosamond Kent. "Parmenides, Plato, and I Corinthians 12". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVI (June, 1967), 211-13.
- Stacey, W. David. The Pauline View of Man: In Relation to its Judaic and Hellenistic Background. London: Macmillan & Co Ltd; New York: St Martin's Press, 1956.
- Stamm, Raymond T. "The Epistle to the Galatians: Introduction and Exegesis". The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951-1957. X, 427-593.
- Stanley, David Michael. Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology. Analecta Biblica: Investigationes Scientifical in Res Biblicas, 13. Rome: E Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1961.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. "ἐγώ". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. II, 343-62.

Stendahl, Krister. "The Called and the Chosen: An Essay on Election". The Root of the Vine: Essays in Biblical Theology. Anton Fridrichsen et al. London: Dacre Press, A. and C. Black Ltd, 1953. Pp. 63-80.

_____. "The Scrolls and the New Testament: An Introduction and a Perspective". The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957. Pp. 1-17.

Stevenson, G. H. "The Imperial Administration". The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. X: The Augustan Empire: 44 B.C.-A.D. 70. Pp. 182-217.

_____. "Communications and Commerce". The Legacy of Rome: Essays by C. Foligno et al. Edited by Cyril Bailey, with an introduction by H. H. Asquith. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1923. Pp. 141-72.

Strachan, Robert Harvey. The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1935.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates. 1st ed. revised. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd; New York: St Martin's Press, 1930.

_____. The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1929.

_____. "The Primitive Text of the Acts". The Journal of Theological Studies, XXXIV (1933), 232-41.

Suggs, M. Jack. "Concerning the Date of Paul's Macedonian Ministry". Novum Testamentum, IV (1960), 60-68.

_____. "'The Word is Near You': Romans 10:6-10 Within the Purpose of the Letter". Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. Edited by W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1967. Pp. 289-312.

Szilágyi, János. "Illyricum". Der Kleine Pauly Lexikon der Antike. Bearbeitet und Herausgegeben von Konrat Ziegler und Walther Southeimer. Bd. II, 1367-70.

Taylor, Theophilus Mills. "The Place of Origin of Romans". Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (1948), 281-95.

Taylor, Vincent. The Names of Jesus. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1953.

Tcherikover, Victor. Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews. Translated by S. Applebaum. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1959.

- Thornton, Lionel S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ. 4th ed., with an appreciation by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Westminster: dacre press, 1963.
- Trocme, Étienne. "L'Épître aux Romains et la Méthode Missionnaire de L'Apôtre Paul". New Testament Studies, VII (January, 1961), 148-53.
- Turner, C. H. "The Chronology of the New Testament: II. The Apostolic Age". A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by James Hastings. I, 415b-425a.
- Unnik, W. C. van. "Jesus the Christ". New Testament Studies, VIII (January, 1962), 101-16.
- _____. Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth. Translated by George Ogg. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.
- Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. Translated by John McHugh. 2d ed. London: Darton, Longmann & Todd, 1965.
- Vriezen, Th. C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. 2d ed., revised and enlarged. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.
- Weiss, Johannes. Der erste Korintherbrief. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begründet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. 5. Abt., 10. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925.
- _____. The History of Primitive Christianity. Completed after his death by Rudolf Knopf. Translated by Four Friends. Edited by Frederick C. Grant. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co. Limited, 1937.
- _____. Paul and Jesus. Translated by H. J. Chaytor. Harper's Library of Living Thought. London and New York: Harper & Brothers, 1909.
- Westermann, Claus. Isaiah 40 - 66: A Commentary. Translated by David M. G. Stalker. The Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1969.
- Whiteley, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.
- Wilcke, Hans-Alwin. Das Problem eines messianischen Zwischenreichs bei Paulus. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, LI. Zürich/Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1967.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. "Was heisst bei Paulus: 'Aus Werken des Gesetzes wird kein Mensch gerecht'?" Evangelisch Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Vorarbeiten. Heft 1. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1969.
- Wilder, Amos Niven. "The Church and Israel in the Light of

Election". Studia Evangelica, IV [see supra under F. M. Cross], 347-57.

_____. Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964.

_____. "Eschatological Imagery and Earthly Circumstance". New Testament Studies, V (July, 1959), 229-45.

Williams, Charles Stephen Conway. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Black's New Testament Commentaries. 2d ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1964.

Wilson, R. McL. "Gnostics--in Galatia?". Studia Evangelica, IV [see supra under F. M. Cross], 358-67.

Windisch, Hans. "βάρβαρος". Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. I, 546-53.

_____. "ἑλλήν, . . ." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. II, 504-16.

Wolfe, Rolland Emerson. "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve". Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LIII (1935), 90-129.

Ziesler, J. A. The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, XX. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1972.